arXiv:1605.06917v1 [math.DS] 23 May 2016

EXPONENTIAL DISTRIBUTION OF RETURN TIMES FOR WEAKLY MARKOV SYSTEMS

ŁUKASZ PAWELEC, MARIUSZ URBAŃSKI, AND ANNA ZDUNIK

Abstract. We introduce the concept of weakly Markov dynamical systems. We prove for them the asymptotic convergence, along the radii of relative Lebesgue measure converging very fast to one, to the exponential law of the distribution of the the first return times to almost every shrinking ball. We prove that weakly Markov dynamical systems include such large classes of smooth dynamical systems as expanding repellers, holomorphic endomorphisms of complex projective spaces, and Axiom A diffeomorphisms (none of them are assumed to be conformal) and conformal ones such as conformal iterated function systems, conformal graph directed Markov systems, conformal expanding repellers, rational functions of the Riemann sphere, and transcendental meromorphic functions. For the conformal systems we in fact prove much more, namely that the convergence to the exponential law is along all radii. This is achieved by proving the thin annuli property.

Contents

1. Introduction 2
2. Exponential distribution 2
3. Conformal Graph Directed Markov Systems and Iterated Function Systems — Preliminaries 9
4. Handling *thin annuli* with IFSs 11
5. Proving *thin annuli* for most radii 17
6. Applications and examples 20
6.1. Exponential One Law for Conformal Graph Directed Markov systems and Conformal Iterated Function Systems 21
6.2. Conformal Expanding Repellers 25
6.3. Equilibrium states for rational maps of the Riemann sphere $\widehat{\mathbb{C}}$ and Hölder continuous potentials with a pressure gap 27
6.4. Dynamically Semi–Regular Meromorphic Functions 30
6.5. Distance Expanding Maps and Expanding Repellers 34
6.6. Equilibrium measures (states) for holomorphic endomorphisms of complex projective spaces 34
6.7. Axiom A diffeomorphisms 35
References 36

1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 37B20, Secondary 37A25.

Key words and phrases. return time, decay of correlations, exponential law.

The research of M. Urbański was supported in part by the NSF Grant DMS 1361677. A. Zdunik was supported in part by the NCN grant 2014/13/B/ST1/04551 .

1. Introduction

In this paper we deal with asymptotic statistics of return times to shrinking objects that are formed by ordinary open balls with radii converging to zero. We introduce the concept of weakly Markov dynamical systems and prove for them the asymptotic convergence to the exponential law of the distribution of the first return times to almost every shrinking ball. The concept of weakly Markov systems captures and extends that of loosely Markov systems of [Urb] and of earlies works on the subject such as [STV]. The advantage of this approach is that now no transfer operators are involved, and merely the exponential decay of correlations is assumed along with two other standard hypotheses. This permits us to prove the exponential law if the balls shrink along the radii of relative Lebesgue measure converging very fast to one, see Theorem 8. This theorem applies to all systems considered in Section 6 entirely devoted to examples. It in particular applies to systems which are not necessarily conformal such as expanding repellers, holomorphic endomorphisms of complex projective spaces, and Axiom A diffeomorphisms. This last class of systems, Axiom A diffeomorphisms, is of particular significance, since these systems are invertible and consequently, the method of transfer operators does not automatically apply; these are not loosely Markov systems. Our method allows us to obtain a simple and transparent proof of exponential one law for this class of systems. See [Hir] for the existing recurrence results for Axiom A diffeomorphisms.

In order to get convergence to the exponential law along all radii, so far in the field of return times, when doing this it was customary to just assume that the limit of the ratio of the measure of an appropriately thin annulus to the measure of the ball enclosing it converges to zero when the radii of the balls do so; we call this property the thin annuli property. Up to our best knowledge no serious attempt has been as yet made to verify this hypothesis in some reasonable generality. We do it for large classes of conformal systems which in particular include iterated function systems, graph directed Markov systems, conformal expanding repellers, rational functions of the Riemann sphere, and transcendental meromorphic functions. We underline that we do not impose any separation condition on the iterated function system (graph directed Markov system). All these classes for which our proof applies are described in detail in Section 6 which, we repeat, is entirely devoted to examples.

2. Exponential distribution

We will denote the open ball of radius r centred at x by both $B(x,r)$ and $B_r(x)$ depending on the appropriate context. Recall the following standard definition:

Definition 1. For a locally finite Borel measure μ on a metric space, define the *lower and upper pointwise dimensions, denoted respectively by $\underline{d}_\mu$ and $\overline{d}_\mu$, of the measure μ* by

$$\underline{d}_\mu(z) = \liminf_{r\to 0} \frac{\ln\big(\mu(B_r(z))\big)}{\ln r}, \qquad \overline{d}_\mu(z) = \limsup_{r\to 0} \frac{\ln\big(\mu(B_r(z))\big)}{\ln r}.$$

The ratio property introduced in this paper is defined as follows:

Definition 2. A measure is said to have a *thin annuli property* if for μ–almost every x there exists $\kappa_x > 0$ such that

$$\lim_{r\to 0} \frac{\mu\left(B(x, r + r^{\kappa_x}) \setminus B(x, r)\right)}{\mu\left(B(x, r)\right)} = 0. \qquad \mu\text{–a.e.} \tag{2.1}$$

Denote by $\mathcal{H}^\xi(X)$ the vector space of all Hölder continuous functions on a compact, metric space X with exponent ξ, i.e. $f \in \mathcal{H}^\xi(X)$ if f is continuous and $v_\xi(f) < \infty$, where

$$v_\xi(f) = \inf\left\{H_f \colon \forall_{x,y\in X} |f(x) - f(y)| \le H_f(\rho(x, y))^\xi\right\}. \tag{2.2}$$

This space is commonly endowed with the norm:

$$||f||_\xi = ||f||_\infty + v_\xi(f), \tag{2.3}$$

and then becomes a Banach space.

Let $(T, X, \mu, \mathcal{B}, \rho)$ be a metric measure preserving dynamical system. By this we mean that (X, ρ) is a metric space, $\mathcal{B}$ is the σ-algebra of Borel subsets of X, and $T : X \to X$ is a Borel measurable map preserving a Borel probability measure μ on X. Given a set $U \subset X$ and $x \in X$ denote

$$\tau_U(x) := \min\{n \ge 1 : T^n(x) \in U\},$$

and call it the entry time to U. Denote further the first return of a set U into itself under the map T by

$$\tau(U) := \min_{x\in U} \tau_U(x).$$

Definition 3. We will call a metric measure preserving dynamical system $(T, X, \mu, \mathcal{B}, \rho)$ *Weakly Markov*, if it satisfies the following conditions (i) to (iii):

(i) *Exponential Decay of Correlations*: There exists $\gamma \in (0, 1)$, which in general depends on ξ, such that for all $g \in \mathcal{H}^\xi$, all $f \in L_1(\mu)$ and every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we have

$$|\mu\left(f \circ T^n \cdot g\right) - \mu(g) \cdot \mu(f)| \le C\gamma^n ||g||_\xi \mu(|f|); \tag{2.4}$$

(ii) *Pointwise sensibility*: $0 < \underline{d}_\mu(x) \le \overline{d}_\mu(x) < +\infty$ for μ–a.e. $x \in X$;

(iii) *No small returns*: $\liminf_{r\to 0} \dfrac{\tau\big(B_r(x)\big)}{-\ln(r)} > 0$ for μ–a.e. $x \in X$.

In addition, if measure μ also has the *thin annuli property*, then we will call the system $(T, X, \mu, \mathcal{B}, \rho)$ *weakly Markov with thin annuli*.

Remark 4. The *no small returns* property has been proved to hold for many dynamical systems; check e.g. [STV]. This also is easy to prove for open transitive distance expanding maps and measures μ being Gibbs/equilibrium states of Hölder continuous potentials.

Remark 5. The second named author introduced the concept of *Loosely Markov* systems in [Urb]. These systems are required to assume (ii), a stronger version of (i) and a Weak Partition Existence Condition, which implies (iii), as it was observed in [Urb]. Since we shall also make use of this condition, we formulate it below.

Definition 6. A system is said to satisfy Weak Partition Existence Condition if there exists a countable partition α with $h_\mu(f,\alpha) > 0$, such that for μ–a.e. $x \in X$ there exists $\chi = \chi(x) > 0$ such that

$$B(x, \exp(-n\chi)) \subset \alpha_n(x) \tag{2.5}$$

for all n sufficiently large.

Remark. The aforementioned stronger version of (i) says that the iterates of the appropriate Perron–Frobenius operator, applied to a Hölder continuous function, converge exponentially fast.

In our approach we avoid working with the Perron–Frobenius operator, and use directly our condition (i). This allows us to use the Theorem for the system for which the exponential decay of correlation has been proved, but the speed of convergence of the iterates of Perron–Frobenius operator is not clear, or not known. This also allows us to formulate the results for classical invertible systems with exponential decay of correlation.

Recall that given a finite measure μ and a measurable set A we denote by μ_A the conditional measure on A, i. e.

$$\mu_A(F) := \frac{\mu(F)}{\mu(A)}$$

for every measurable subset F of A.

Theorem 7. *For $(T, X, \mu, \mathcal{B}, \rho)$, a* weakly Markov system with thin annuli*, the distribution of the entry time tends to the exponential one law*

$$\sup_{t\geq 0}\left|\mu\left(\left\{z \in X\colon \tau_{B_r(x)}(z) > \frac{t}{\mu(B_r(x))}\right\}\right) - e^{-t}\right| \xrightarrow{r\to 0} 0 \tag{2.6}$$

for μ–a.e. $x \in X$, and also the distribution of normalized return time tends to the exponential one law

$$\sup_{t\geq 0}\left|\mu_{B_r(x)}\left(\left\{z \in B_r(x)\colon \tau_{B_r(x)}(z) > \frac{t}{\mu(B_r(x))}\right\}\right) - e^{-t}\right| \xrightarrow{r\to 0} 0 \tag{2.7}$$

for μ–a.e. $x \in X$.

Relaxing the thin annuli hypothesis, we still get a quite strong version of the exponential one law for general weakly Markov systems. Indeed, we may apply the results from section 5, namely Corollary 26, which states that the thin annuli property is satisfied for most radii. Precise statement follows.

Theorem 8. *Given a* weakly Markov system $(T, X, \mu, \mathcal{B}, \rho)$*, for μ–a.e. $x \in X$, the entry time tends to the exponential distribution*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\sup_{t\geq 0}\left|\mu\left(\left\{z \in X\colon \tau_{B_{r_n}(x)}(z) > \frac{t}{\mu(B_{r_n}(x))}\right\}\right) - e^{-t}\right| = 0 \tag{2.8}$$

for most *choices of the sequence* r_n*, where* "most choices" *means that the subset of radii within an interval* $[0, s]$ *omits no more than a set of Lebesgue measure of order* $O\left(-s^{-\ln(s)}\ln(s)\right)$.
The same is true for the normalized return time.

Note. For example, this gives that even without assuming the *thin annuli* the lower limits in (2.6) and (2.7) are equal to 0.

In order to prove Theorem 7 and Theorem 8, we shall apply the results obtained in [HSV]. More precisely, we will need to use two theorems from there. First, that the distribution of the first return time into a fixed set is close to the exponential law if and only if the distributions of the first return time and first entry are close. Second, that we can bound this, mentioned in the previous sentence, *closeness* by quite easy to control expressions. We will finish the proof by estimating those expressions.

Proof of Theorem 7. The proof is divided into three separate steps, first employing Theorems 9 and 10, then proving Theorem 11, and the conclusion of the proof follows immediately by combining these three theorems.

Theorem 9 gives the limiting exponential distribution, if we prove that a certain function $d(B_r)$ goes to 0.

Theorem 10 bounds $d(B_r)$ from above by 3 quantities $a_N(B_r)$, $b_N(B_r)$ and $N\mu(B_r)$.

Finally, Theorem 11 shows that for a certain number $N = N(r)$ those three quantities all tend to 0 simultaneously, ending the proof of Theorem 7. □

Proof of Theorem 8. The proof of Theorem 8 goes in exactly the same way, but we use Theorem 11 only for those radii for which we have the thin annuli property. In Section 5 we prove that *most radii* have the thin annuli property, see Corollary 26. □

Let us start with some notation; it has been introduced in the aforementioned paper. For a fixed set U let us define

$$c(k, U) := \mu_U(\tau > k) - \mu(\tau > k),$$
$$c(U) := \sup_{k\in\mathbb{N}} |c(k, U)|.$$

The first result from [HSV] is this:

Theorem 9. *For a measure preserving transformation the distributions of both the first return time and first entry time differ from the exponential law by an expression which tends to 0 if both* $\mu(U)$ *and* $c(U)$ *go to 0. More precisely, for entry time*

$$\sup_{t\geq 0}\left|\mu\left(\left\{z \in X : \tau_U(z) > \frac{t}{\mu(U)}\right\}\right) - e^{-t}\right| \leq d(U) \tag{2.9}$$

and also for return time

$$\sup_{t\geq 0}\left|\mu_U\left(\left\{z \in U : \tau_U(z) > \frac{t}{\mu(U)}\right\}\right) - e^{-t}\right| \leq d(U), \tag{2.10}$$

where $d(U) = 4\mu(U) + c(U)\big(1 - \ln c(U)\big)$.

The second theorem (also from [HSV]) gives an estimate on the value of $c(U)$.

Theorem 10. *With the transformation as above:*

$$c(U) \leq \inf_{N\in\mathbb{N}} \{a_N(U) + b_N(U) + N\mu(U)\},$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} a_N(U) &= \mu_U(\{\tau_U \leq N\}), \\ b_N(U) &= \sup_{V\in\mathcal{B}} \left|\mu_U\big(T^{-N}V\big) - \mu\big(V\big)\right| = \\ &= \sup_{V\in\mathcal{B}} \left|\frac{\mu\big(U\cap T^{-N}V\big) - \mu(U)\mu\big(V\big)}{\mu(U)}\right| \end{aligned}$$

and $\mathcal{B}$ is the σ-algebra of Borel sets.

Remark. Note that for a fixed set U the number $a_N(U)$ grows to 1 as $N \to +\infty$, whereas $b_N(U)$ tends to 0 (provided that the system has some mixing properties). The tricky part is to find a number N such that b_N has become small, but a_N and $N\cdot\mu(U)$ have not grown too big.

The proof of Theorem 7 follows easily from those two theorems and from the next result.

Theorem 11. *If a system $(T, X, \mu, \mathcal{B}, \rho)$ is weakly Markov with thin annuli, then there exists $n_r(x)$ such that all three values $a_{n_r}(B_r(x))$ and $b_{n_r}(B_r(x))$ and $n_r\cdot\mu(B_r(x))$ tend to 0 as $r \to 0$ for μ–almost all $x \in X$.*

Proof. We will write B_r instead of $B_r(x)$, when dependence on x is not important. Put $n_r = \mu(B_r)^{-\theta}$. Obviously if $\theta < 1$ we get $n_r\cdot\mu(B_r) \to 0$ instantly. So it remains to find θ such that both a_{n_r} and b_{n_r} will tend to 0.

Firstly, let us rewrite the *no small returns* assumption: there exists a Borel set $V \subset X$ of full μ measure and measurable functions $\chi(x), \rho_1(x)$ positive μ–a.e. such that

$$B_r(x) \cap T^{-k}\big(B_r(x)\big) = \emptyset \tag{2.11}$$

for all $x \in V$, all $r < \rho_1(x)$ and all integers $k \leq \chi(x)\ln(1/r)$.

Secondly, the assumptions imposed on pointwise dimension give that there exists a set $W \subset V \subset X$, again of full measure, such that for all $x \in W$

$$r^{2\overline{d}_\mu(x)} \leq \mu\left(B_r(x)\right) \leq r^{\underline{d}_\mu(x)/2}, \tag{2.12}$$

for all $r < \rho_2(x)$ with a certain measurable, positive μ–a.e. function $\rho_2(x)$. Now let us define a family of Lipschitz continuous functions approximating a characteristic function on a ball; depending on a parameter radius $r > 0$, $\kappa > 0$, and $x \in X$. First — auxiliary:

$$\phi_r^\kappa(t) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{for } 0 \leq t \leq r \\ r^{-\kappa}(r + r^\kappa - t) & \text{for } r \leq t \leq r + r^\kappa \\ 0 & \text{for } t \geq r + r^\kappa \end{cases},$$

The functions we are looking for are

$$g^{\kappa}_{r,x}(z) = \phi^{\kappa}_r(\rho(z,x)).$$

We will denote them simply by g_r. The Lipschitz constant of g_r equals $r^{-\kappa}$ as metric ρ is 1–Lipschitz. In particular their Hölder norm (needed in the definition of exponential decay of correlations) is bounded above by $||g_r||_\xi \leq 1 + r^{-\kappa} \approx r^{-\kappa}$ (for small r).

Fix $x \in W \subset V$ and sufficiently small $r > 0$. Set $f_r := \mathbb{1}_{B_r}$. Note that $f_r \leq g_r$. Recall that

$$a_N(B_r) = \mu_{B_r}\left(\tau_{B_r} \leq N\right) = \mu_{B_r}\left(\bigcup_{n=1}^{N} T^{-n}(B_r)\right) \leq \sum_{n=1}^{N} \frac{\mu\left(B_r \cap T^{-n}(B_r)\right)}{\mu(B_r)}.$$

As $x \in V$ we know that some first intersections are empty. Putting $\chi := \chi(x)$, this yields:

$$a_N(B_r) \leq \sum_{n=-\chi\ln(r)}^{N} \frac{\mu\left(B_r \cap T^{-n}(B_r)\right)}{\mu(B_r)}.$$

The assumption (2.4) on decay of correlations gives

$$\begin{aligned}\mu\left(B_r \cap T^{-n}(B_r)\right) &= \mu\left(f_r \circ T^n \cdot f_r\right) \leq \mu\left(f_r \circ T^n \cdot g_r\right)\\ &\leq \mu(g_r)\cdot\mu(f_r) + C\gamma^n||g_r||_\xi\mu(f_r)\\ &\leq \mu(f_r)\left(\mu(g_r) + C\gamma^n r^{-\kappa}\right).\end{aligned}$$

This allows us to rewrite the estimate on a_N and later to bound the sum's elements as simply as possible in the following way

$$\begin{aligned}a_N(B_r) &\leq \sum_{n=-\chi\ln(r)}^{N}\left(\mu(g_r) + C\gamma^n r^{-\kappa}\right) \leq N\mu(g_r) + Cr^{-\kappa}\sum_{n=-\chi\ln(r)}^{+\infty}\gamma^n\\ &= N\mu(g_r) + \frac{C}{1-\gamma}r^{-\kappa}\gamma^{-\chi\ln(r)}\\ &= N\mu(g_r) + Dr^{-\kappa-\chi\ln(\gamma)}.\end{aligned} \tag{2.13}$$

If $\kappa \leq 1$ we get an estimate, using (2.12):

$$\mu(g_r) \leq \mu\left(B(x, r+r^\kappa)\right) \leq \mu\left(B(x,2r^\kappa)\right) \leq 2^{\underline{d}_\mu(x)/2}r^{\kappa\underline{d}_\mu(x)/2}. \tag{2.14}$$

Take $\theta > 0$ as small as needed in the course of the proof and fix $N = n_r = \mu(B_r)^{-\theta}$. Inserting (2.14) into (2.13), and using (2.12) again, we get

$$\begin{aligned}a_{n_r}(B_r) &\leq \mu(B_r)^{-\theta}\cdot 2^{\underline{d}_\mu(x)/2}r^{\kappa\underline{d}_\mu(x)/2} + Dr^{-\kappa-\chi\ln(\gamma)} \leq\\ &\leq Er^{-2\theta\overline{d}_\mu(x)}r^{\kappa\underline{d}_\mu(x)/2} + Dr^{-\kappa-\chi\ln(\gamma)},\end{aligned}$$

with some positive constants D and E. If we take $\kappa < -\chi\ln(\gamma)$ and then any θ so small that $2\theta\overline{d}_\mu(x) < \kappa\underline{d}_\mu(x)/2$, we arrive at the conclusion that

$$\lim_{r\to 0} a_{n_r}(B_r) = 0. \tag{2.15}$$

It is worth noting that in this calculation κ is taken small, and we do not use here any estimate of the measure of annuli from above. In particular, the above estimate of a_n does not require the thin annuli property.

Now we turn to the task of estimating $b_{n_r}(B_r(x))$. The point $x \in W$ is as above. Fix a Borel set H, and take $\kappa = \kappa_x > 0$ satisfying the *thin annuli* assumption (2.1). Then

$$\begin{aligned}\Big|\mu\big(B_r \cap T^{-N}(H)\big) - \mu(B_r)\mu\big(H\big)\Big| &= \big|\mu\big(\mathbb{1}_H \circ T^N \cdot f_r\big) - \mu(\mathbb{1}_H)\mu(f_r)\big| \leq \\ &\leq \big|\mu\big(\mathbb{1}_H \circ T^N \cdot f_r\big) - \mu\big(\mathbb{1}_H \circ T^N \cdot g_r\big)\big| + \\ &+ \big|\mu\big(\mathbb{1}_H \circ T^N \cdot g_r\big) - \mu(\mathbb{1}_H)\mu(g_r)\big| + \\ &+ \big|\mu(\mathbb{1}_H)\mu(g_r) - \mu(\mathbb{1}_H)\mu(f_r)\big|.\end{aligned}$$

So $\mu(B_r)b_{n_r}(B_r)$ is bounded by the supremum (over all Borel sets $H \subset X$) of the above three terms.

The third expression bounding b_{n_r} is estimated easily:

$$\begin{aligned}\mu(B_r)^{-1}\big|\mu(\mathbb{1}_H)\mu(g_r) - \mu(\mathbb{1}_H)\mu(f_r)\big| &\leq \mu(B_r)^{-1}\big(\mu(g_r) - \mu(f_r)\big) \leq \\ &\leq \mu(B_r)^{-1}\big(\mu(B(x, r + r^\kappa) - \mu(B(x, r)\big) = \\ &= \frac{\mu\left(B(x, r + r^\kappa) \setminus B(x, r)\right)}{\mu(B_r)}.\end{aligned}$$

This tends to 0 because of the thin annuli assumption. The first term is bounded in the same way:

$$\big|\mu\big(\mathbb{1}_H \circ T^N \cdot f_r\big) - \mu\big(\mathbb{1}_H \circ T^N \cdot g_r\big)\big| \leq \big(\mu(g_r) - \mu(f_r)\big).$$

Dealing with the second we may use the exponential decay of correlations:

$$\big|\mu\big(\mathbb{1}_H \circ T^N \cdot g_r\big) - \mu(\mathbb{1}_H)\mu(g_r)\big| \leq C\gamma^N r^{-\kappa}\mu(\mathbb{1}_H) \leq C\gamma^N r^{-\kappa}.$$

Using the pointwise dimensions formula (2.12) we get $n_r = \mu(B_r)^{-\theta} \geq r^{-\theta \underline{d}_\mu(x)/2}$ and using it again we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned}\mu(B_r)^{-1}\Big|\mu\big(\mathbb{1}_H \circ T^N \cdot g_r\big) - \mu(\mathbb{1}_H)\mu(g_r)\Big| &\leq \\ &\leq Cr^{-\kappa - 2\overline{d}_\mu(x)}\gamma^{r^{-\theta \underline{d}_\mu(x)/2}} \\ &= Ce^{-\kappa \ln(r) - 2\overline{d}_\mu(x)\ln(r) + r^{-\theta \underline{d}_\mu(x)/2}\ln(\gamma)},\end{aligned}$$

and the last estimate converges to zero as $r \to 0$ if

$$\lim_{r \to 0} \kappa \ln(r) r^{\theta \underline{d}_\mu(x)/2} = 0, \tag{2.16}$$

which holds for any finite κ (see also note after the proof). We conclude that

$$\lim_{r \to 0} b_{n_r}(B_r) = 0. \tag{2.17}$$

and this ends the proof. □

Remark 12. In fact we may weaken the *thin annuli assumption* by taking instead of a fixed κ_x a function $\kappa_x(r)$ satisfying the definition below, which is just what is needed for (2.16) to hold.

Definition 13. A function $\kappa\colon (0,1) \to \mathbb{R}_+$ will be called *subpoly* if

$$\lim_{r\to 0} \kappa(r) r^{\varepsilon} = 0 \tag{2.18}$$

for every $\varepsilon > 0$.

Note. A standard example of *subpoly* function is $\kappa(r) = -\ln(r)$.

3. Conformal Graph Directed Markov Systems and Iterated Function Systems — Preliminaries

Let us define a graph directed Markov system (abbr. GDMS) relative to a directed multigraph (V, E, i, t) and an incidence matrix A. Such systems are studied at length in [MauU3]. A *directed multigraph* consists of

- A finite set V of vertices,
- A countable (either finite or infinite) set E of directed edges,
- A map $A : E \times E \to \{0,1\}$ called an *incidence matrix* on (V, E),
- Two functions $i, t : E \to V$, such that $A_{ab} = 1$ implies $t(b) = i(a)$.

Now suppose that in addition, we have a collection of nonempty compact metric spaces $\{X_v\}_{v\in V}$ and a number $\lambda \in (0,1)$, and that for every $e \in E$, we have a one-to-one contraction $\phi_e : X_{t(e)} \to X_{i(e)}$ with Lipschitz constant $\leq \lambda$. Then the collection

$$\mathcal{S} = \{\phi_e : X_{t(e)} \to X_{i(e)}\}_{e\in E}$$

is called a *graph directed Markov system* (or *GDMS*). We now describe the limit set of the system $\mathcal{S}$. For every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ let

$$E_A^n := \{\omega \in E^n : \forall (1 \leq j \leq n-1)\ A_{\omega_j \omega_{j+1}} = 1\},$$

and let E_A^0 be the set consisting of the empty word. Then let

$$E_A^* := \bigcup_{n=0}^{\infty} E_A^n$$

and

$$E_A^\infty := \{\omega \in E^\infty :\ \text{every finite subword of } \omega \text{ is in } E_A^*\}.$$

The above union defining E_A^* is disjoint and for every $\omega \in E_A^*$ we denote by $|\omega|$ the unique integer n such that $\omega \in E_A^n$; we call $|\omega|$ the *length* of ω. For each $\omega \in E_A^\infty$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we write

$$\omega|_n := \omega_1 \omega_2 \ldots \omega_n \in E_A^n.$$

For each $n \geq 1$ and $\omega \in E_A^n$, we let $i(\omega) = i(\omega_1)$ and $t(\omega) = t(\omega_n)$, and we let

$$\phi_\omega := \phi_{\omega_1} \circ \cdots \circ \phi_{\omega_n} : X_{t(\omega)} \to X_{i(\omega)}.$$

For $\omega \in E_A^\infty$, the sets $\{\phi_{\omega|_n}\left(X_{t(\omega_n)}\right)\}_{n\geq 1}$ form a descending sequence of nonempty compact sets and therefore $\bigcap_{n\geq 1}\phi_{\omega|_n}\left(X_{t(\omega_n)}\right)\neq\emptyset$. Since for every $n\geq 1$,

$$\operatorname{diam}\left(\phi_{\omega|_n}\left(X_{t(\omega_n)}\right)\right)\leq \lambda^n \operatorname{diam}\left(X_{t(\omega_n)}\right)\leq \lambda^n \max\{\operatorname{diam}(X_v): v\in V\},$$

we conclude that the intersection

$$\bigcap_{n\in\mathbb{N}}\phi_{\omega|_n}\left(X_{t(\omega_n)}\right)$$

is a singleton and we denote its only element by $\pi(\omega)$. In this way we have defined a map

$$\pi: E_A^\infty \to \coprod_{v\in V} X_v,$$

where $\coprod_{v\in V} X_v$ is the disjoint union of the compact sets X_v $(v\in V)$. The map π is called the *coding map*, and the set

$$J=J_{\mathcal{S}}=\pi(E_A^\infty)$$

is called the *limit set* of the GDMS $\mathcal{S}$. The sets

$$J_v=\pi(\{\omega\in E_A^\infty : i(\omega_1)=v\})\ \ (v\in V)$$

are called the *local limit sets* of $\mathcal{S}$.

We call the GDMS $\mathcal{S}$ *finite* if the alphabet E is finite. Furthermore, we call $\mathcal{S}$ *maximal* if for all $a,b\in E$, we have $A_{ab}=1$ if and only if $t(b)=i(a)$. In [MauU3], a maximal GDMS was called a *graph directed system* (abbr. GDS). Finally, we call a maximal GDMS $\mathcal{S}$ an *iterated function system* (or *IFS*) if V, the set of vertices of $\mathcal{S}$, is a singleton. Equivalently, a GDMS is an IFS if and only if the set of vertices of $\mathcal{S}$ is a singleton and all entries of the incidence matrix A are equal to 1.

Definition 14. We call the GDMS $\mathcal{S}$ and its incidence matrix A *finitely (symbolically) irreducible* if there exists a finite set $\Lambda\subset E_A^*$ such that for all $a,b\in E$ there exists a word $\omega\in\Lambda$ such that the concatenation $a\omega b$ is in E_A^*. $\mathcal{S}$ and A are called *finitely primitive* if the set Λ may be chosen to consist of words all having the same length. Note that all IFSs are finitely primitive.

Intending to pass to geometry and following [MauU3], we call a GDMS *conformal* if for some $d\in\mathbb{N}$, the following conditions are satisfied:

(a) For every vertex $v\in V$, X_v is a compact connected subset of $\mathbb{R}^d$, and $X_v=\overline{\operatorname{Int}(X_v)}$.
(b) There exists a family of open connected sets $W_v\subset X_v$ $(v\in V)$ such that for every $e\in E$, the map ϕ_e extends to a C^1 conformal diffeomorphism from $W_{t(e)}$ into $W_{i(e)}$ with Lipschitz constant $\leq\lambda$.
(c) There are two constants $L\geq 1$ and $\alpha>0$ such that for every $e\in E$ and every pair of points $x,y\in X_{t(e)}$,

$$\left||\phi_e'(y)|-|\phi_e'(x)|\right|\leq L\|(\phi_e')^{-1}\|^{-1}\|y-x\|^\alpha,$$

where $|\phi_\omega'(x)|$ denotes the scaling of the derivative (which is a similarity).

Remark 15. If $d \geq 2$ and a family $\mathcal{S} = \{\phi_e\}_{e\in E}$ satisfies the conditions (a) and (b), then it also satisfies condition (c) with $\alpha = 1$. When $d = 2$ this is due to the well-known Koebe's distortion theorem (see for example, [Co, Theorem 7.16], [Co, Theorem 7.9], or [Hi, Theorem 7.4.6]). When $d \geq 3$ it is due to [MauU3] depending heavily on Liouville's representation theorem for conformal mappings (see [IM] for a detailed development leading up to the strongest current version including references to the historical background).

Remark 16. We do emphasize that in the above definition we do not need and we do not require any separation condition whatsoever. In particular even its weakest form

$$\phi_a\left(\mathrm{Int}(X_{t(a)})\right) \cap \phi_b\left(\mathrm{Int}(X_{t(b)})\right) = \emptyset.$$

for all $a, b \in E$ such that $a \neq b$, known as the Open Set Condition, is not assumed to hold. We also do emphasize that we do not impose any form of boundary regularity, in particular no Cone Condition of [MauU3].

4. Handling *thin annuli* with IFSs

In this section we deal with issue of thin annuli for conformal IFSs

$$\mathcal{S} = \{\phi_e : X \to X\}_{e\in E},$$

where $X \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, $d \geq 1$. For the sake of brevity we denote

$$D(\omega) := \mathrm{diam}(\phi_\omega(X))$$

for all $\omega \in E^*$. The Bounded Distortion Property tells us that

$$Q^{-1}D(\omega)D(\tau) \leq D(\omega\tau) \leq QD(\omega)D(\tau) \tag{4.1}$$

for all $\omega, \tau \in E^*$ and some constant $Q \geq 1$. In this section we consider a (really large) class, called $\mathcal{M}_E$, of Borel probability measures μ on the symbol space E^∞, determined by the following three requirements:

(A) Weak Independence:

$$P^{-1}\mu([\omega])\mu([\tau]) \leq \mu([\omega\tau]) \leq P\mu([\omega])\mu([\tau])$$

for some constant $P \geq 1$ and all $\omega, \tau \in E^*$.

(B) There exists $\beta > 0$ such that $\sum_{e\in E} \frac{\mu([e])}{D(e)^\beta} < +\infty$.

(C) The limit set $J_\mathcal{S}$ is not contained in any proper, i.e. of dimension $\leq d-1$, real analytic sub-manifold (precisely: is not contained in a conformal image of a hyperplane/sphere).

Remark 17. All Gibbs measures, on the symbol space E^∞, introduced and considered in [MauU2] are weakly independent, i.e. enjoy the property (A). It is easy to have abundance of such measures satisfying the property (B); among them are the Gibbs states of all (geometrically most significant) potentials $E^\infty \ni \omega \mapsto t \log\left|\phi'_{\omega_1}(\pi(\sigma(\omega)))\right| \in \mathbb{R}$.

Let us denote an annulus centred at x with radii r and $r + r^3$ as $R(x, r, r^3)$, i.e.

$$R(x, r, r^3) = B(x, r + r^3) \setminus B(x, r)$$

Theorem 18. *If $\mathcal{S} = \{\phi_e : X \to X\}_{e\in E}$ is a conformal IFS, then for every $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_E$ the measure $\mu \circ \pi^{-1}$ on $J_{\mathcal{S}}$ has the* thin annuli property *with $\kappa = 3$ (in fact this is true for any $\kappa > 1$). In other words:*

$$\lim_{r\to 0} \frac{\mu \circ \pi^{-1}\left(R(x,r,r^3)\right)}{\mu \circ \pi^{-1}\left(B(x,r)\right)} = 0 \qquad \mu \circ \pi^{-1}\text{–a.e.}$$

It should be noted that the proofs in this section have been strongly influenced by the techniques of [DFSU].

It should be also underlined that we do not assume in this theorem any separation condition for the IFS.

The proof of this theorem consists of several steps listed below. We shall prove all of them. For the sake of brevity we denote

$$\hat{\mu} := \mu \circ \pi^{-1}.$$

Lemma 19. *There exist constants $\rho > 0$, $H < \infty$ and a finite set $F \subset E^*$ such that for any $x \in J_{\mathcal{S}}$, any radius $0 < r < \rho$, and any finite word $\omega \in E^*$, with diameter $D(\omega) \geq Hr^3$, there exists a word $\tau \in F$ such that $\pi([\omega\tau])$ does not intersect the annulus $R(x,r,r^3)$. In symbols:*

$$\pi([\omega\tau]) \cap R(x,r,r^3) = \emptyset.$$

Lemma 20. *There exist $\alpha > 0$, $C < \infty$ and $\rho > 0$ such that for all $0 < r < \rho$ and any finite word $\omega \in E^*$, with diameter $D(\omega) \geq r^2$, we have*

$$\mu\left([\omega] \cap \pi^{-1}(R(x,r,r^3))\right) \leq Cr^{\alpha}\mu([\omega]). \tag{4.2}$$

Lemma 21. *For any numbers $0 < A < B$ define the set*

$$T_A^B := \left\{\omega \in E^{\mathbb{N}} \colon \forall_{k\in\mathbb{N}}\, D(\omega|_k) \notin (A,B)\right\}. \tag{4.3}$$

Then there exists $C < \infty$ for which $\mu(T_A^B) \leq C\left(\frac{A}{B}\right)^{\beta} \ln\left(\frac{\operatorname{diam} X}{A}\right)$, where β is the constant from condition (B).

Lemma 22. *Let ν be an arbitrary Borel probability measure defined on some bounded Borel set $X \subset \mathbb{R}^d$. Let F be a measurable subset of X. Define*

$$S(F,c,\rho) = \left\{x \in X \colon \nu(B(x,\rho) \cap F) > c\nu(B(x,\rho))\nu(F)\right\}. \tag{4.4}$$

Then for any numbers $c, \rho > 0$ we have $\nu(S(F,c,\rho)) \leq M/c$, where M is some constant depending only on the space X.

Proof of Lemma 19. Assume without loss of generality that $E = \mathbb{N}$. Seeking a contradiction suppose that there exist a sequence $(r_n)_{n=1}^{\infty} \searrow 0$, sequence $x_n \in J_{\mathcal{S}}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ finite words $\omega^{(n)} \in E^*$ with diameters satisfying

$$D(\omega^{(n)}) \geq nr_n^3 \tag{4.5}$$

such that for every $\tau \in \{1,2,\ldots,n\}^n$ the "cylinder" $\pi([\omega^{(n)}\tau])$ intersects $R(x_n,r_n,r_n^3)$. Let us denote

$$R_n := R(x_n,r_n,r_n^3) \quad \text{and} \quad S_n := \partial B(x_n,r_n) = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : ||x - x_n|| = r_n\}.$$

Take then any sequence of similarities T_n, $n \geq 1$, for which $0 \in T_n(\pi([\omega^{(n)}]))$ and $|T_n'| = (D(\omega^{(n)}))^{-1}$ for all $n \geq 1$. Note that $(T_n \circ \phi_{\omega^{(n)}})_{n=1}^{\infty}$ is a bounded equicontinuous sequence of conformal maps with derivatives uniformly bounded from above and uniformly separated from zero. Therefore, applying Ascoli-Arzela Theorem and passing to an appropriate subsequence we will have that the sequence $(T_n \circ \phi_{\omega^{(n)}})_{n=1}^{\infty}$ converges uniformly on X to a conformal map $U : X \to \mathbb{R}^d$. Now, working with the one-point (Alexandrov) compactification $\hat{\mathbb{R}}^d$ of $\mathbb{R}^d$, with ∞ as the compactifying point, endowing $\hat{\mathbb{R}}^d$ with spherical metric, and then the collection $\mathcal{K}_d$ of non-empty compact subsets of $\hat{\mathbb{R}}^d$ with the corresponding Hausdorff metric d_H, we see that the collection Γ of all geometric spheres of $\hat{\mathbb{R}}^d$ (including the spheres containing infinity (hyperplanes) and singletons) forms a compact subset of $\mathcal{K}_d$. Since $T_n(S_n) \in \Gamma$, passing to a subsequence, we can therefore assume without loss of generality that $T_n(S_n)$ converges in the Hausdorff metric d_H to some element $Q \in \Gamma$. Observe that, by (4.5), the quotient of the outer and inter radii of the annulus $T_n(R_n)$ converges to one as $n \to \infty$ and therefore also

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} T_n(R_n) = Q. \tag{4.6}$$

Observe also that by condition (C) for every $M \in \Gamma$ there exists a point $w_M \in J_{\mathcal{S}}$ such that $\operatorname{dist}(w_M, M) > 0$. Writing the $w_{U^{-1}(Q)} = \pi(\xi) \in J_{\mathcal{S}}$, $\xi \in E^{\mathbb{N}}$, we have that

$$\operatorname{dist}(\pi(\xi), U^{-1}(Q)) > 0.$$

We therefore conclude that there exists $k \geq 1$ such that

$$\operatorname{dist}\left(\pi([\xi|_k]), U^{-1}(Q)\right) > 0. \tag{4.7}$$

Consider now only integers $n \geq k$ so large that all letters forming $\xi|_k$ belong to $\{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$. By our contrary hypothesis

$$\phi_{\omega^{(n)}}\left(\phi_{\xi|_k}(J_{\mathcal{S}})\right) \cap R_n = \phi_{\omega^{(n)}\xi|_k}(J_{\mathcal{S}}) \cap R_n \neq \emptyset.$$

Fix an arbitrary $z_n \in J_{\mathcal{S}}$ such that $\phi_{\omega^{(n)}\xi|_k}(z_n) \in R_n$. Passing to a subsequence we may assume without loss of generality that $\lim_{n\to\infty} z_n = z \in X$ for some point $z \in \overline{J}_{\mathcal{S}}$. Then, invoking also (4.6), we get that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} T_n \circ \phi_{\omega^{(n)}}(\phi_{\xi|_k}(z)) = U(\phi_{\xi|_k}(z)) \in Q.$$

Hence $\phi_{\xi|_k}(z) \in U^{-1}(Q)$, and as $\phi_{\xi|_k}(z) \in \overline{\pi([\xi|_k])}$, this contradicts (4.7) and finishes the proof of our lemma. □

We will also need in this section the following fact that has been proved in [BS].

Proposition 23. *Any Borel probability measure on* $\mathbb{R}^n$ *is* weakly diametrically regular*, i.e. for* μ*–almost every* $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ *and every* $\varepsilon > 0$ *there exists* $\delta > 0$ *such that for all* $0 < r < \delta$

$$\mu(B(x, 2r)) \leq \mu(B(x, r))r^{-\varepsilon}. \tag{4.8}$$

In the next section we will prove its strengthening which will be needed and used therein.

Proof of Lemma 20. Take ρ, H and the set F given by Lemma 19. First of all observe that, because the lengths of all words in F are uniformly bounded above, by taking an iterate of the system $\mathcal{S}$ we may assume that $F \subset E$ (instead of E^*). Fix $x \in J_{\mathcal{S}}$, $0 < r < \rho$, and denote $R := R(x, r, r^3)$.

We will in fact prove a stronger fact; namely that

$$\mu\left([\omega] \cap \pi^{-1}(R)\right) \leq \left(\frac{Hr^3}{D(\omega)}\right)^{\alpha} \mu([\omega]), \tag{4.9}$$

for all $\omega \in E^*$. This will trivially prove the lemma as its hypotheses require that $D(\omega) \geq r^2$. So, we now focus on the proof of (4.9). First note that if $D(\omega) \leq Hr^3$, then inequality (4.9) is trivial. Also for all $n \geq 1$ big enough and all $\omega \in E^n$ we have $D(\omega) \leq Hr^3$. Now let us work *from the bottom upwards*. Take a cylinder $[\omega]$ such that (4.9) is already proven for all subcylinders $[\omega e]$, $e \in E$. We have

$$\mu([\omega] \cap \pi^{-1}(R)) = \sum_{e \in E} \mu([\omega e] \cap \pi^{-1}(R))$$

and, applying Lemma 19, we may drop at least one element of this sum, say $b \in E$, to get

$$\begin{aligned}
\mu([\omega] \cap \pi^{-1}(R)) &= \sum_{E \ni a \neq b} \mu([\omega a] \cap \pi^{-1}(R)) \\
&\leq \sum_{E \ni a \neq b} \left(\frac{Hr^3}{D(\omega a)}\right)^{\alpha} \mu([\omega a]) \\
&= \left(Hr^3\right)^{\alpha} \sum_{E \ni a \neq b} \frac{\mu([\omega a])}{(D(\omega a))^{\alpha}},
\end{aligned}$$

where we used the estimate (4.9) for every cylinder $[\omega a]$. In order to prove the required inequality we need to have

$$\sum_{E \ni a \neq b} \frac{\mu([\omega a])}{(D(\omega a))^{\alpha}} \leq \frac{\mu([\omega])}{(D(\omega))^{\alpha}} = \sum_{a \in E} \frac{\mu([\omega a])}{(D(\omega))^{\alpha}},$$

where the equality sign trivially holds. Simplifying this gives

$$\sum_{E \ni a \neq b} \left(\left(\frac{D(\omega)}{D(\omega a)}\right)^{\alpha} - 1\right) \mu([\omega a]) \leq \mu([\omega b]).$$

Applying Bounded Distortion Property (4.1) and Weak Independence of μ, i.e. condition (A), we see that it is thus enough to prove that

$$\sum_{E \ni a \neq b} \left(\left(\frac{QD(\omega)}{D(\omega)D(a)}\right)^{\alpha} - 1\right) P\mu([\omega])\mu([a]) \leq P^{-1}\mu([\omega])\mu([b]).$$

Recall that b was chosen from a finite set so $P^{-2}\mu([b])$ is bounded away from zero, say $P^{-2}\mu([b]) > \delta$ for some fixed $\delta > 0$. Simplifying again, we get

$$\sum_{E \ni a \neq b} \left(\left(\frac{Q}{D(a)} \right)^{\alpha} - 1 \right) \mu([a]) \leq \delta.$$

Therefore, it is enough to have

$$\sum_{E \ni a \neq b} \frac{\mu([a])}{D(a)^{\alpha}} \leq Q^{-\alpha}\delta + \sum_{E \ni a \neq b} \mu([a]).$$

But since, by Assumption (B), the series on the left-hand side of this formula converges for all $\alpha > 0$ small enough, this formula will hold for all $\alpha > 0$ small enough. Thus the proof is complete. □

Proof of Lemma 21. First, divide T_A^B into disjoint subsets (for $k = 0, 1 \ldots$)

$$T_A^B(k) = \left\{ \omega \in E^{\mathbb{N}} \colon D(\omega|_{k+1}) \leq A < B \leq D(\omega|_k) \right\}.$$

Recall that $s = \sup_{e \in E}\{|\phi_e'|\} < 1$. For any cylinder $D(\omega|_k) \leq s^k \operatorname{diam}(X)$, so for any $n \geq N := \log_s \left(\frac{A}{\operatorname{diam} X} \right)$ we have $D(\omega|_n) \leq A$ and $T_A^B(n) = \emptyset$. This allows us to write

$$\mu(T_A^B) \leq \sum_{n=0}^{N} \mu\left(T_A^B(n) \right). \tag{4.10}$$

Now, fix $0 \leq k \leq N$ and $\omega \in E^{\mathbb{N}}$. If $D(\omega|_k) < B$, then $\mu\left(T_A^B(k) \cap [\omega|_k] \right) = 0$. If $D(\omega|_k) \geq B$, then

$$\mu\left(T_A^B(k) \cap [\omega|_k] \right) = \sum_e \mu([\omega|_k e]),$$

where the sum is taken over those $e \in E$ for which $D(\omega|_k e) \leq A$. Applying the Weak Independence of μ, i.e. condition (A) and Bounded Distortion (4.1), we further get

$$\mu\left(T_A^B(k) \cap [\omega|_k] \right) \leq \sum_{D(\omega|_k a) \leq A} P\mu([\omega|_k])\mu([a]) \leq \sum_{Q^{-1}D(\omega|_k)D(a) \leq A} P\mu([\omega|_k])\mu([a]),$$

and using the fact that $D(\omega|_k) \geq B$, this gives

$$\mu(T_A^B(k) \cap [\omega|_k]) \leq P\mu([\omega|_k]) \sum_{D(a) \leq QA/B} \mu([a]). \tag{4.11}$$

By Assumption (B) we may write:

$$\begin{aligned} +\infty > Z := \sum_{a \in E} \frac{\mu([a])}{D(a)^{\beta}} &\geq \sum_{D(a) \leq QA/B} \frac{\mu([a])}{D(a)^{\beta}} \geq \sum_{D(a) \leq QA/B} \frac{\mu([a])}{(QA/B)^{\beta}} \\ &= \sum_{D(a) \leq QA/B} \mu([a]) \left(\frac{B}{QA} \right)^{\beta}. \end{aligned}$$

Combining this estimate with (4.11) gives

$$\mu\left(T_A^B(k)\cap[\omega|_k]\right)\le P\mu([\omega|_k])\cdot Z\left(\frac{QA}{B}\right)^\beta,$$

and summing over all cylinders $[\omega|_k]$, this gives $\mu(T_A^B(k))\le C(A/B)^\beta$ with some constant C. Finally applying (4.10), we get

$$\mu(T_A^B)\le \log_s\left(\frac{A}{\operatorname{diam} X}\right)\cdot C\left(\frac{A}{B}\right)^\beta,$$

which finishes the proof. □

Proof of Lemma 22. Set

$$S:=S(F,c,\rho).$$

By Besicovitch's Covering Theorem there exists a covering of S with balls $B(x_i,\rho)$, $i\in I$, all centred at S, with finite multiplicity M_d depending only on the dimension d. The following estimate uses first, the definition of S and then the bounded by M_d multiplicity of covering.

$$\nu(S)\le\sum_{i\in I}\nu(B(x_i,\rho))\le\sum_{i\in I}\frac{\nu(B(x_i,\rho)\cap F)}{c\nu(F)}\le\frac{M_d\nu(F)}{c\nu(F)}=\frac{M_d}{c}.$$ □

Proof of Theorem 18. We will show that for $\hat\mu$ almost every $x\in J_{\mathcal S}$ and all sufficiently small radii $r>0$ we have that

$$\hat\mu(R(x,r,r^3))\le C\hat\mu(B(x,r))r^\gamma$$

for some $\gamma>0$. First, using notation from Lemmas 21 and 22 define

$$T_n:=T_{4^{-n}}^{2^{-n}},\quad n\ge 1,$$

and then

$$S_n:=S(T_n,n^2,4\cdot 2^{-n}).$$

Lemma 22 gives that $\hat\mu(S_n)\le M/n^2$ and so $\sum_n\hat\mu(S_n)<\infty$. Thus the Borel-Cantelli Lemma applies to tell us that for $\hat\mu$ almost every $x\in J_{\mathcal S}$ there exists an integer $K(x)\ge 1$ such that $x\notin S_k$ for all $k\ge K(x)$. Fix $x\in J_{\mathcal S}$ with such property, i. e. an arbitrary x produced by the Borel-Cantelli Lemma. For any $n\ge 1$ define the set

$$C_n=\left\{[\omega]\colon D(\omega)\le 2^{-n}<D(\omega|_{|\omega|-1})\right\}. \tag{4.12}$$

Now, take any $0<r\le 2^{-(K(x)+1)}$. Define $n\ge 1$ so as to satisfy the inequalities $2^{-n-1}<r\le 2^{-n}$. Then

$$n\ge K(x). \tag{4.13}$$

Denote the annulus $R(x,r,r^3)$ by R and cover $\pi^{-1}(R)$ by cylinders from C_n. We estimate the measure

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\mu}(R) = \mu\circ\pi^{-1}(R) &\leq \sum_{[\omega]}{}^{*}\mu([\omega]\cap\pi^{-1}(R))\\ &\leq \underbrace{\sum_{[\omega]\subset T_n}{}^{*}\mu([\omega]\cap\pi^{-1}(R))}_{I} + \underbrace{\sum_{[\omega]\cap T_n=\emptyset}{}^{*}\mu([\omega]\cap\pi^{-1}(R))}_{II},\end{aligned}$$

where the * indicates that the corresponding sum above is taken over all cylinders $[\omega]\in C_n$ intersecting $\pi^{-1}(B(x,r+r^3))$. Recall that for such cylinders $D(\omega)<2r$, and as $r+r^3\leq 2r$, the cylinder $[\omega]$ is contained in the set $\pi^{-1}(B(x,4r))$. So

$$I \leq \sum_{[\omega]\subset T_n}{}^{*}\mu([\omega]) \leq \mu\left(T_n\cap\pi^{-1}(B(x,4r))\right) \leq \mu\left(T_n\cap\pi^{-1}(B(x,4\cdot 2^{-n}))\right).$$

Now, first straightforward from the definition of S_n, and from fact that, because of (4.13), $x\notin S_n$, then by applying Lemma 21, we get that

$$\begin{aligned}I &\leq n^2\mu\left(\pi^{-1}(B(x,4\cdot 2^{-n}))\right)\mu(T_n)\\ &\leq n^2\hat{\mu}\left(B(x,4\cdot 2^{-n})\right)C\left(\frac{4^{-n}}{2^{-n}}\right)^{\beta}\ln\left(\frac{\operatorname{diam}X}{4^{-n}}\right)\\ &\leq n^2\hat{\mu}\left(B(x,4\cdot 2^{-n})\right)\cdot\widehat{C}n2^{-n\beta}\\ &\leq \widetilde{C}\hat{\mu}\left(B(x,8r)\right)r^{\beta/2}\end{aligned}$$

with appropriate constants $\widehat{C}$ and $\widetilde{C}$. Finally we apply the estimate of Proposition 23 with $\varepsilon=\beta/4$ to get

$$I \leq \widetilde{C}\hat{\mu}\left(B(x,r)\right)r^{-\varepsilon}r^{\beta/2} \leq \widetilde{C}\hat{\mu}\left(B(x,r)\right)r^{\beta/4}$$

which completes the estimate of the first sum, i.e. the one labelled by I.

Now, observe that if $[\omega]\cap T_n=\emptyset$, then $D(\omega)\geq 4^{-n}\geq r^2$ and so we may first apply Lemma 20, and then Proposition 23 with $\varepsilon=\alpha/2$ to estimate as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}II &\leq \sum_{[\omega]\cap T_n=\emptyset}{}^{*}Cr^{\alpha}\mu([\omega]) \leq Cr^{\alpha}\hat{\mu}(B(x,4r))\\ &\leq Cr^{\alpha}\hat{\mu}(B(x,r))r^{\varepsilon}\\ &\leq Cr^{\alpha/2}\hat{\mu}(B(x,r)).\end{aligned}$$

This completes the upper estimate of II and finishes the entire proof. □

5. Proving *thin annuli* for most radii

Our main result in this section is Corollary 26 which states that for any finite Borel measure in $\mathbb{R}^d$ the *thin annuli* assumption is fulfilled for Lebesgue most choices of radii. In order to prove it we will need a several technical auxiliary results. We start with the following one, which is a considerable strengthening of Proposition 23.

Theorem 24. *Assume that μ is a Borel probability measure on $\mathbb{R}^d$ and take any $\varepsilon > 0$. Then for μ–a.e. $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and every sufficiently small $r > 0$ (i.e. $0 < r \leq \delta(x)$ and $\delta(x) > 0$ μ–a.e.) we have*

$$\mu\left(B(x, 2r)\right) \leq \log_2^{2+\varepsilon}(1/r)\mu(B(x, r)). \tag{5.1}$$

Moreover,
if s and r are such that $[-\log_2(s)] = [-\log_2(r)]$ (i.e. for some k: $2^{-k-1} < r, s \leq 2^{-k}$), then

$$[-\log_2(r)]^{-1-\varepsilon}\,\mu\left(B(x, r)\right) \leq \mu\left(B(x, s)\right) \leq [-\log_2(r)]^{1+\varepsilon}\,\mu\left(B(x, r)\right). \tag{5.2}$$

Using this theorem will give us the following crucial estimate on the measures of annuli.

Theorem 25. *If μ is a Borel probability measure on $X = \mathbb{R}^d$, then for μ–a.e. $x \in X$, any $\kappa > 1$ and any $A > 0$ the set of those radii $r > 0$ for which*

$$\frac{\mu\left(B(x, r + r^\kappa) \setminus B(x, r)\right)}{\mu\left(B(x, r)\right)} > A \tag{5.3}$$

has zero density at the point $r = 0$.
In other words, if we denote the set of all radii $r > 0$ that do not satisfy the thin annuli property with exponent κ and constant A (the condition above) by Z, then

$$\lim_{u \to 0} \frac{l(Z \cap [0, u])}{l([0, u])} = 0, \text{ where } l \text{ is Lebesgue measure on } \mathbb{R}. \tag{5.4}$$

Moreover, $l(Z \cap [0, u]) = O(-u^\kappa \ln(u))$.

Recall that by Remark 12 we may take $\kappa(r) = -\ln(r)$. Applying this to our context we obtain the following strengthening of Theorem 25.

Corollary 26. *If μ is a Borel probability measure on $X = \mathbb{R}^d$, then for μ–a.e. $x \in X$ and most sequences of radii (r_n) decreasing to 0:*

$$\lim_{n \to +\infty} \frac{\mu\left(B(x, r_n + r_n^{-\ln(r_n)}) \setminus B(x, r_n)\right)}{\mu\left(B(x, r_n)\right)} = 0,$$

where "most sequences" mean that there exists a measurable set $Z \subset (0, +\infty)$ such that $r_n \notin Z$ and $l(Z \cap [0, u]) = O(-u^{-ln(u)} \ln(u))$.
This trivially yields the lower limit *in the definition of* thin annuli *equal to* 0.

Proof of Theorem 24. Fix $(\alpha_n)_{n=1}^\infty$, a sequence of positive real numbers converging to zero and then define *bad* sets

$$Z_n := \{x \colon \mu(B(x, 2^{-n})) \cdot \alpha_n > \mu(B(x, 2^{-n-1}))\}. \tag{5.5}$$

We will show that for every $n \geq 1$ we have that

$$\mu(Z_n) \leq M_d \alpha_n,$$

where M_d is the constant resulting from Besicovitch's Covering Theorem. Indeed, by virtue of this theorem we can cover Z_n by balls $B(z_i, 2^{-n-1})$, $i \in I$, centred at the set Z_n, in such

a way that this covering has multiplicity bounded above by M_d. Now the required estimate is obtained as follows:

$$\mu(Z_n) \leq \sum_{i\in I} \mu(B(z_i, 2^{-n-1})) < \sum_{i\in I} \alpha_n \mu(B(z_i, 2^{-n})) \leq \alpha_n M_d \mu(\mathbb{R}^d) \leq \alpha_n M_d. \tag{5.6}$$

So, if in addition, $\sum_n \alpha_n < +\infty$, then by Borel-Cantelli Lemma μ–a.e. $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ belongs only to finitely many sets Z_n.

Now take $\alpha_n = n^{-1-\varepsilon/2}$ (of course $\sum_n \alpha_n < +\infty$) and fix $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ for which Borel-Cantelli Lemma holds. This means that there exists $N = N(x)$ such that for every $n \geq N$, we have that

$$\mu(B(x, 2^{-n})) \leq n^{1+\varepsilon/2} \mu(B(x, 2^{-n-1})). \tag{5.7}$$

Take any $0 < r \leq 2^{-N-1}$ and put $k = [-\log_2(r)]$, i.e. $2^{-k-1} < r \leq 2^{-k}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(B(x,2r)) &\leq \mu(B(x, 2^{-k+1})) \leq (k-1)^{1+\varepsilon/2} \mu(B(x, 2^{-k})) \\ &\leq k^{1+\varepsilon/2}(k-1)^{1+\varepsilon/2} \mu(B(x, 2^{-k-1})) \leq k^{2+\varepsilon} \mu(B(x,r)) \\ &\leq [-\log_2(r)]^{2+\varepsilon}\, \mu(B(x,r)) \leq \log_2^{2+\varepsilon}\left(\frac{1}{r}\right) \mu(B(x,r)). \end{aligned} \tag{5.8}$$

Remark. By taking $\frac{1}{n\log^2(n)}$ as α_n we could have improve the above estimate (and therefore in (5.1)) to $\log_2^2(1/r)\log^{2+\varepsilon}(\log(1/r))$, etc.

The *moreover part* follows immediately from (5.8). □

Proof of Theorem 25. By Proposition 23 for any $\varepsilon > 0$ and all $r > 0$ sufficiently small, we have

$$\mu\big(B(x,2r)\big) \leq \mu\big(B(x,r)\big) r^{-\varepsilon}. \tag{5.9}$$

Fix some $r_0 > 0$ satisfying (5.9) and say that we have a sequence of n radii $r_n > 0$ fulfilling (5.3), i.e. radii not satisfying the thin annuli property (recall that we denoted the set of such r as Z), such that

$$r_0 \leq r_1 \leq r_1 + r_1^\kappa < r_2 \leq r_2 + r_2^\kappa < r_3 \leq \cdots \leq r_n + r_n^\kappa \leq 2r_0. \tag{5.10}$$

In particular the annuli defined by radii r_n do not intersect. By (5.3), for any $1 \leq p \leq n$, we have that

$$\frac{\mu\left(B(x, r_p + r_p^\kappa)\right)}{\mu\left(B(x, r_p)\right)} > 1 + A. \tag{5.11}$$

Using this estimate n times we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} \mu\left(B(x,r_0)\right) \leq \mu\left(B(x,r_1)\right) \leq \frac{\mu\left(B(x, r_1 + r_1^\kappa)\right)}{1+A} \leq \frac{\mu\left(B(x,r_2)\right)}{1+A} \leq \cdots \\ \cdots \leq \frac{\mu\left(B(x,r_n)\right)}{(1+A)^n} \leq \frac{\mu\left(B(x,2r_0)\right)}{(1+A)^n} \end{aligned}$$

Applying further (5.9) yields

$$\mu(B(x,r_0)) \le \frac{\mu(B(x,r_0))r_0^{-\varepsilon}}{(1+A)^n}.$$

This shows that

$$r_0^{\varepsilon} \le (1+A)^{-n}, \quad \text{giving the estimate:} \quad n \le \frac{-\varepsilon \ln(r_0)}{\ln(1+A)}. \tag{5.12}$$

Now divide the set of radii $[r_0, 2r_0]$ into intervals of length $(2r_0)^\kappa$, i.e. define:

$$I_1 = [r_0, r_0 + (2r_0)^\kappa)\,,\ \ldots\ , I_k = [r_0 + (n-1)(2r_0)^\kappa, r_0 + n(2r_0)^\kappa)\,,\ \ldots$$

for all $k \ge 1$ until $(k+1)(2r_0)^\kappa \ge 2r_0$.

Observe that if we take a point $s \in I_p$, then $s + s^\kappa \in I_p \cup I_{p+1}$. This means that any interval of the form $[r_p, r_p + r_p^\kappa]$, $1 \le p \le n$, intersects at most two intervals of the form I_k. So, the set $Z \cap [r_0, 2r_0]$ is contained in at most $\frac{-2\varepsilon \ln(r_0)}{\ln(1+A)}$ intervals of the form I_k. The total length of those intervals is bounded by

$$l(Z \cap [r_0, 2r_0]) \le (2r_0)^\kappa \cdot \frac{-2\varepsilon \ln(r_0)}{\ln(1+A)} = -Cr_0^\kappa \ln(r_0), \tag{5.13}$$

with some constant $C > 0$. We end our proof by summing estimates:

$$\begin{aligned} l(Z \cap [0, r_0]) &\le \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} l\left(Z \cap \left[\frac{r_0}{2^j}, \frac{r_0}{2^{j-1}}\right]\right) \\ &\le \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} -C\left(\frac{r_0}{2^j}\right)^\kappa \ln\left(\frac{r_0}{2^j}\right) = O\left(-r_0^\kappa \ln(r_0)\right). \end{aligned} \tag{5.14}$$

Obviously, this shows that

$$\lim_{u\to 0} \frac{l(Z \cap [0,u])}{l([0,u])} = \lim_{u\to 0} \frac{O\left(-u^\kappa \ln(u)\right)}{u} = 0 \qquad \text{for } \kappa > 1. \tag{5.15}$$

The proof is complete. □

6. Applications and examples

In this section we shall provide seven fairly large and general classes of dynamical systems for which our theorems from the previous sections do apply. All these systems dealt with in seven subsections will be proved to satisfy the Weakly Markov Property and the corresponding exponential one laws of Theorem 8 will hold for them. Moreover, the first four sections will concern conformal systems and, in addition, the Thin Annuli Property will be proved for them, resulting in the corresponding stronger exponential one laws of Theorem 7.

6.1. **Exponential One Law for Conformal Graph Directed Markov systems and Conformal Iterated Function Systems.** In this subsection we apply our results about the exponential distribution of statistics of return times, namely Theorem 7 for weakly Markov systems and also the thin annuli property (Theorem 18) for conformal IFSs to obtain the statistics of exponential one law for dynamical systems naturally induced by conformal GDMSs, in particular by conformal IFSs. So, let

$$\mathcal{S} := \{\phi_e : X_{t(e)} \to X_{i(e)} : e \in E\}$$

be a conformal GDMS as defined in Section 3 and let $A : E \times E \to \{0, 1\}$ denote its incidence matrix. We assume throughout the subsection that A (and so also $\mathcal{S}$) is finitely irreducible. This time we however assume in addition that the Open Set Condition, in fact the Strong Open Set Condition of [MauU3] holds. The Open Set Condition means that

$$\phi_a\left(\mathrm{Int}(X_{t(a)})\right) \cap \phi_b\left(\mathrm{Int}(X_{t(b)})\right) = \emptyset \tag{6.1}$$

whenever $a, b \in E$ with $a \neq b$. By a standard induction this condition implies that

$$\phi_\omega\left(\mathrm{Int}(X_{t(\omega)})\right) \cap \phi_\tau\left(\mathrm{Int}(X_{t(\tau)})\right) = \emptyset \tag{6.2}$$

whenever ω and τ are any two incomparable words in E_A^*. The Strong Open Set Condition requires that in addition

$$J_{\mathcal{S}} \cap \mathrm{Int}(X) \neq \emptyset.$$

At the end of this section we will need the concepts introduced below along with some relations holding between them that are also recorded below.

Definition 27. We say that a real number s belongs to $\Gamma_{\mathcal{S}}$ if

$$\sum_{e\in E} ||\phi_e'||_\infty^s < +\infty. \tag{6.3}$$

Let us record the following immediate observation.
We recall from [MauU1] and [MauU3] the following definitions:

$$\gamma_{\mathcal{S}} := \inf \Gamma_{\mathcal{S}} = \inf\left\{ s \in \mathbb{R} : \sum_{e\in E} ||\phi_e'||_\infty^s < +\infty \right\}.$$

Note that if the alphabet E is finite then $\gamma_{\mathcal{S}} = -\infty$ and if E is infinite, then $\gamma_{\mathcal{S}} \geq 0$. The proofs of the following two statements can be found in [MauU3].

Proposition 28. *If $\mathcal{S}$ is a finitely irreducible conformal GDMS, then for every $s \geq 0$ we have that*

$$\Gamma_{\mathcal{S}} = \{s \in \mathbb{R} : \mathrm{P}(s) < +\infty\}$$

In particular,

$$\gamma_{\mathcal{S}} := \inf\{s \in \mathbb{R} : \mathrm{P}(s) < +\infty\}.$$

Now let $f : E_A^{\mathbb{N}} \to \mathbb{R}$ be a Hölder continuous function, called in the sequel potential. We assume that f is summable, meaning that

$$\sum_{e\in E} \exp\big(\sup(f|_{[e]})\big) < +\infty.$$

It is well known (see [MauU3] or [MauU2]) that the following limit

$$\mathrm{P}(f) := \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \sum_{\omega\in E_A^n} \exp\big(\sup(f|_{[\omega]})\big)$$

exists. It is called the topological pressure of f. It was proved in [MauU2] (cf. [MauU3]) that there exists a unique shift-invariant Gibbs/equilibrium measure μ_f for the potential f. The Gibbs property means that

$$C_f^{-1} \le \frac{\mu_f([\omega|_n])}{\exp\big(S_n f(\omega) - \mathrm{P}(f)n\big)} \le C_f$$

with some constant $C_f \ge 1$ for every $\omega \in E_A^{\mathbb{N}}$ and every integer $n \ge 1$, where here and in the sequel throughout this subsection

$$S_n(g) = g_n(\omega) := \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} g\circ\sigma^j$$

for every function $g : E_A^{\mathbb{N}} \to \mathbb{C}$. Let us record the following basic properties of the Gibbs state μ_f.

Fact 1. *If the matrix A is finitely irreducible and if $f : E_A^{\mathbb{N}} \to \mathbb{R}$ is a summable Hölder continuous potential, then the unique Gibbs state μ_f is ergodic and its topological support is equal to $E_A^{\mathbb{N}}$. In addition μ_f enjoys the Weak Independence Property* (A).

Ergodicity has been proved in [MauU3] while the Weak Independence Property (A) follows immediately from the definition of μ_f.

Following [Urb] we introduce the set

$$\mathring{J}_{\mathcal{S}} := J_{\mathcal{S}} \setminus \bigcup_{\omega\in E_A^*} \phi_\omega(\partial X_{t(\omega)}).$$

We define

$$\mathring{E}_A^{\mathbb{N}} := \pi_{\mathcal{S}}^{-1}\big(\mathring{J}\big)$$

and notice that for every $z \in \mathring{J}_{\mathcal{S}}$ there exists a unique $\omega(z) \in E_A^{\mathbb{N}}$ such that

$$z = \pi(\omega(z)).$$

Moreover, $\omega(z) \in \mathring{E}_A^{\mathbb{N}}$ and we simply denote it by $\pi^{-1}(z)$. Note that

$$\sigma\big(\mathring{E}_A^{\mathbb{N}}\big) \subset \mathring{E}_A^{\mathbb{N}}$$

and this restricted shift map induces a map $T_{\mathcal{S}} : \mathring{J}_{\mathcal{S}} \to \mathring{J}_{\mathcal{S}}$ by the formula

$$T_{\mathcal{S}}(z) = \pi\circ\sigma(\pi^{-1}(z)) \in \mathring{J}_{\mathcal{S}},$$

so that the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathring{E}_A^{\mathbb{N}} & \xrightarrow{\sigma} & \mathring{E}_A^{\mathbb{N}} \\ {\scriptstyle\pi}\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle\pi} \\ \mathring{J}_{\mathcal{S}} & \xrightarrow[T_{\mathcal{S}}]{} & \mathring{J}_{\mathcal{S}} \end{array}$$

commutes and the map $\pi : \mathring{E}_A^{\mathbb{N}} \to \mathring{J}_{\mathcal{S}}$ is a continuous bijection. The map $T_{\mathcal{S}} : \mathring{J}_{\mathcal{S}} \to \mathring{J}_{\mathcal{S}}$ is the main object of our interest in this subsection. Following notation of Section 4 we denote

$$\hat{\mu}_f := \mu_f \circ \pi^{-1}.$$

The following observation we deduce directly from Fact 1.

Observation 29. *Suppose that $\mathcal{S}$ is a finitely irreducible conformal GDMS satisfying the Strong Open Set Condition. If $f : E_A^{\mathbb{N}} \to \mathbb{R}$ is a summable Hölder continuous potential, then*

$$\mu_f\big(\mathring{E}_A^{\mathbb{N}}\big) = 1 \quad \textit{and} \quad \hat{\mu}_f\big(\mathring{J}_{\mathcal{S}}\big) = 1.$$

Moreover, the projection $\pi : \mathring{E}_A^{\mathbb{N}} \to \mathring{J}_{\mathcal{S}}$ establishes a measure–preserving isomorphism between measure–preserving dynamical systems $\big(\sigma : \mathring{E}_A^{\mathbb{N}} \to \mathring{E}_A^{\mathbb{N}}, \mu_f\big)$ and $\big(T_{\mathcal{S}} : \mathring{J}_{\mathcal{S}} \to \mathring{J}_{\mathcal{S}}, \hat{\mu}_f\big)$.

We shall prove the following.

Theorem 30. *Suppose that $\mathcal{S}$ is a finitely irreducible conformal GDMS satisfying the Strong Open Set Condition and Condition C. If $f : E_A^{\mathbb{N}} \to \mathbb{R}$ is a summable Hölder continuous potential such that*

$$\sum_{e\in E} \exp\big(\inf\big(f|_{[e]}\big)\big)||\phi_e'||^{-\beta} < +\infty \tag{6.4}$$

for some $\beta > 0$, then the measure–preserving dynamical system $\big(T_{\mathcal{S}} : \mathring{J}_{\mathcal{S}} \to \mathring{J}_{\mathcal{S}}, \hat{\mu}_f\big)$ is weakly Markov and satisfies the thin annuli property. In particular, the exponential one laws of (2.6) *and* (2.7) *hold for the dynamical system $\big(T_{\mathcal{S}} : \mathring{J}_{\mathcal{S}} \to \mathring{J}_{\mathcal{S}}, \hat{\mu}_f\big)$.*

Proof. Property (i) of being weakly Markov (i. e. of Definition 3) for the dynamical system $\big(\sigma : \mathring{E}_A^{\mathbb{N}} \to \mathring{E}_A^{\mathbb{N}}, \mu_f\big)$ has been proved in [MauU3]. For the dynamical system $\big(T_{\mathcal{S}} : \mathring{J}_{\mathcal{S}} \to \mathring{J}_{\mathcal{S}}, \hat{\mu}_f\big)$ it then follows from its equivalence to $\big(\sigma : \mathring{E}_A^{\mathbb{N}} \to \mathring{E}_A^{\mathbb{N}}, \mu_f\big)$ in the category of measure–preserving dynamical systems. Property (ii) has been also proved in [MauU3]. By virtue of Remark 5, in order to prove property (iii), it is enough to check that the Weak Partition Existence Condition holds. We do it now. Indeed, let

$$\alpha := \{[e]\}_{e\in E}$$

be the partition of $\mathring{E}_A^{\mathbb{N}}$ into cylinders of length one and let

$$\pi(\alpha) := \{\pi([e])\}_{e\in E} = \{\phi_e(J_{\mathcal{S}})\}_{e\in E}.$$

Then

$$\alpha_\sigma^n = \{[\omega] : \omega \in E_A^n\}$$

and

$$\pi(\alpha)_T^n = \pi(\alpha_\sigma^n) = \{\phi_\omega(\mathring{J}_\mathcal{S}) : \omega \in E_A^n\}.$$

We know from [MauU3] that $\mathrm{h}_{\mu_f}(\sigma, \alpha) = \mathrm{h}_{\mu_f}(\sigma) \in (0, +\infty)$, and so, by isomorphism, $\mathrm{h}_{\hat{\mu}_f}(T, \pi(\alpha)) \in (0, +\infty)$. We also know from [MauU3] that for μ_f–a.e. $\omega \in \mathring{E}_A^{\mathbb{N}}$, say $\omega \in F \subset \mathring{E}_A^{\mathbb{N}}$ with $\mu_f(F) = 1$, the limit

$$\chi_{\mu_f}(\omega) := -\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \left|\phi'_{\omega|_n}(\pi(\sigma^n(\omega)))\right|$$

exists, is equal to

$$\chi_{\mu_f} := \int_{\mathring{E}_A^{\mathbb{N}}} \log \left|\phi'_1(\pi(\sigma(\omega)))\right| d\mu_f$$

and belongs to $(0, +\infty)$. For every $v \in V$ fix $\xi_v \in \mathrm{Int}(X_v)$, and the fix $R > 0$ so small that $B(\xi_v, R) \subset \mathrm{Int}(X_v)$ for every $v \in V$. Using the Distortion Property we conclude that for every $\omega \in F$ and every integer $n \geq 1$,

$$\begin{aligned}\pi(\alpha)_T^n(\pi(\omega)) &= \phi_{\omega|_n}\big(\mathrm{Int}\big(X_{t(\sigma^n(\omega))}\big)\big) \supset \phi_{\omega|_n}\big(B(\xi_{t(\omega_{n+1})}, R)\big)\\ &\supset B\big(\pi(\omega), K^{-1}R\big|\phi'_{\omega|_n}(\pi(\sigma^n(\omega)))\big|\big)\\ &\supset B\big(\pi(\omega), \exp(-2\chi_{\mu_f} n)\big),\end{aligned}$$

where the last inclusion holds for all $n \geq 1$ large (depending on ω) enough. Since $\hat{\mu}_f(\pi(F)) = 1$, this establishes the Weak Partition Existence Condition. Property (A) trivially holds for $\hat{\mu}_f$ and (B) is satisfied because of (6.4). Since, see Theorem 18, measure $\hat{\mu}_f$ satisfies the Thin Annuli Property for IFSs, we are done in the case when $\mathcal{S}$ is an IFS. In the general case we need an inducing argument. We only need to show that $\hat{\mu}_f$ satisfies the Thin Annuli Property. Fix $a \in E$ arbitrary and consider the following collection of A-admissible words.

$$E_a := \big\{\tau \in E_A^* : \tau_1 = a,\ \forall_{2\leq k\leq|\tau|}\, \tau_k \neq a,\ A_{\tau_{|\tau|}a} = 1\big\}.$$

This gives rise to the following system of conformal uniformly contracting maps

$$\mathcal{S}_a := \big\{\phi_\tau|_{\phi_a(X_{t(a)})} : \phi_a\big(X_{t(a)}\big) \to \phi_a\big(X_{t(a)}\big)\big\}.$$

It is evident that $E_a^* \subset E_A^*$ and that $\mathcal{S}_a$ forms a conformal IFS whose limit set is contained in $J_\mathcal{S} \cap \phi_a\big(X_{t(a)}\big)$; in the same vein the first return map $\sigma_a : [a] \to [a]$ is canonically isomorphic to the full shift from $E_a^{\mathbb{N}}$ to $E_a^{\mathbb{N}}$. Moreover, the conditional measure $\mu_{a,f}$ on $[a]$ is the only Gibbs/equilibrium state of the shift map $\sigma_a : [a] \to [a]$ and the Hölder continuous summable potential

$$E_a \ni \omega \longmapsto S_{|\omega_1|}f(\omega) - \mathrm{P}(f)|\omega_1| \in \mathbb{R},$$

where $|\omega_1|$ maintains its original meaning as the length of a word in E_A^* and $S_{|\omega_1|}f$ denotes a Birkhoff's sum with respect to the original shift map $\sigma : E_A^{\mathbb{N}} \to E_A^{\mathbb{N}}$. It therefore follows from the already proven cases of IFSs that $\mu_{a,f}$ satisfies the Thin Annuli Property. Since, by Poincaré Recurrence Theorem,

$$\mu_f\big(\phi_e(X_{t(e)}) \cap J_{\mathcal{S}_e}\big) = \mu_f\big(\phi_e(X_{t(e)})\big)$$

and since

$$B(z,r) \subset \mathrm{Int}\big(\phi_{\pi^{-1}(z)}(X_{t(\pi^{-1}(z))})\big) \subset \phi_{\pi^{-1}(z)}\big(X_{t(\pi^{-1}(z))}\big)$$

for all radii $r > 0$ small enough, we therefore conclude that μ_f itself has the Thin Annuli Property. The proof is complete. □

As an immediate consequence of this theorem we get the following.

Corollary 31. *Suppose that $\mathcal{S}$ is a finitely irreducible conformal GDMS satisfying the Strong Open Set Condition and Condition C. fix a real number $t > \gamma_{\mathcal{S}}$. Then the corresponding measure–preserving dynamical system $\big(T_{\mathcal{S}} : \mathring{J}_{\mathcal{S}} \to \mathring{J}_{\mathcal{S}}, \hat{\mu}_t\big)$ is weakly Markov and satisfies the thin annuli property. In particular, the exponential one laws of* (2.6) *and* (2.7) *hold for the dynamical system $\big(T_{\mathcal{S}} : \mathring{J}_{\mathcal{S}} \to \mathring{J}_{\mathcal{S}}, \hat{\mu}_t\big)$.*

Remark 32. Note that if the system $\mathcal{S}$ of Theorem 30 is finite then the hypothesis (6.4) is automatically satisfied and can be removed from its assumptions.

6.2. **Conformal Expanding Repellers.** In this section, as well as in Sections 6.3, 6.5, 6.6 and 6.7, we will need the classical concepts of topological pressure, variational principle, and equilibrium states. We bring them up now. Let X be a compact metrizable space. Let $T : X \to X$ be a continuous map. Finally, let $\varphi : X \to \mathbb{R}$ be a continuous function. As it is customary we denote by $\mathrm{P}(\varphi)$ its topological pressure with respect to the dynamical system generated by the map $T : X \to X$. The precise definition of pressure and basic properties can be found in any book on dynamical systems which touches on thermodynamic formalism; for example [Bo], [Wa], or [PU2]. The most important of these properties is the following formula, commonly referred to as the Variational Principle.

$$\mathrm{P}(\varphi) = \sup\Big\{\mathrm{h}_\mu(f) + \int_X \varphi d\mu\Big\}, \tag{6.5}$$

where the supremum is taken over all Borel probability T-invariant measures on X. Taking the supremum over such all ergodic measures will give the same value. Any such measure for which the above supremum is attained is called the equilibrium state (or measure) of φ.

Now let us formulate the definition of a conformal expanding repeller, the primary object of interest in this subsection.

Definition 33. Let U be an open subset of $\mathbb{R}^d$, $d \geq 1$. Let J be a compact subset of U. Let $T : U \to \mathbb{R}^d$ be a conformal map. The map T is called a conformal expanding repeller if the following conditions are satisfied:

(1) $T(J) = J$,

(2) $|T'_{|J}| > 1$,

(3) there exists an open set V such that $\overline{V} \subset U$ and

$$J = \bigcap_{k=0}^{\infty} T^{-n}(V).$$

(4) the map $T_{|J} : J \to J$ is topologically transitive.

Note that T is not required to be one-to-one; in fact usually it is not one-to-one. Abusing notation slightly we frequently refer also to the set J alone as a conformal expanding repeller. In order to use a uniform terminology we also call J the limit set of T.

Typical examples of conformal expanding repellers are provided by the following.

Proposition 34. *If $f : \hat{\mathbb{C}} \to \hat{\mathbb{C}}$ is a rational function of degree $d \geq 2$, such that the map f restricted to its Julia set $J(f)$ is expanding, then $J(f)$ is a conformal expanding repeller.*

The basic concept associated with such repellers which will be used in this section is given by the following definition.

Definition 35. A finite cover $\mathcal{R} = \{R_1, \ldots, R_q\}$ of X is said to be a Markov partition of the space X for the mapping T if the following conditions are satisfied.

(a) $R_i = \overline{\mathrm{Int} R_i}$ for all $i = 1, 2, \ldots, q$.

(b) $\mathrm{Int} R_i \cap \mathrm{Int} R_j = \emptyset$ for all $i \neq j$.

(c) $\mathrm{Int} R_j \cap T(\mathrm{Int} R_i) \neq \emptyset \implies R_j \subset T(R_i)$ for all $i, j = 1, 2, \ldots, q$.

The elements of a Markov partition will be called cells in the sequel. The basic theorem about Markov partitions proved in [PU2] is this.

Theorem 36. *Any conformal expanding repeller $T : J \to J$ admits Markov partitions of arbitrarily small diameters.*

We shall prove the following main result of this subsection.

Theorem 37. *Let $T : J \to J$ be a conformal expanding repeller such that J is not contained in any real analytic submanifold of dimension $\leq d - 1$. Let $\psi : J \to \mathbb{R}$ be a Hölder continuous potential and, see* [PU2]*, let μ_ψ be the corresponding equilibrium (also frequently referred to as Gibbs) state. Then the measure–preserving dynamical system $\big(T : J \to J, \mu_\psi\big)$ is weakly Markov and satisfies the thin annuli property. In particular, the exponential one laws of* (2.6) *and* (2.7) *hold for the dynamical system $\big(T : J \to J, \mu_\psi\big)$.*

Proof. Property (i) of being weakly Markov (i. e. of Definition 3) for the dynamical system $\big(f : J \to J, \mu_\psi\big)$ has been proved in [PU2]. Property (ii) also has been proved therein. For property (iii) and the thin boundary property we also use [PU2], namely Markov partitions discussed above and their basic properties. Fix $\delta > 0$ so small that for every $x \in X$ and every $n \geq 0$ there exists $T_x^{-n} : B(T^n(x), 4\delta) \to \mathbb{R}^d$, a unique continuous branch of T^{-n} sending $T^n(x)$ to x. Theorem 36 guarantees us the existence of $\mathcal{R} = \{R_1, \ldots, R_q\}$, a Markov partition of T with all cells of diameter smaller than δ. Having Markov partition $\mathcal{R}$ we now associate to it a finite graph directed Markov system. The set of vertices is equal to $\mathcal{R}$ while the alphabet E is defined as follows.

$$E := \big\{(i, j) \in \{1, 2 \ldots, q\} \times \{1, 2 \ldots, q\} : \mathrm{Int} R_j \cap T(\mathrm{Int} R_i) \neq \emptyset\big\}.$$

Now, for every $(i,j) \in E$ there exists a unique conformal map $T_{i,j}^{-1} : B(R_j, \delta) \to \mathbb{R}^d$ such that

$$T_{i,j}^{-1}(R_j) \subset R_i.$$

Define the incidence matrix $A : E \times E \to \{0,1\}$ by

$$A_{(i,j)(k,l)} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \ l = i \\ 0 & \text{if } \ l \neq i. \end{cases}$$

Define further

$$t(i,j) = j \ \text{ and } \ \ i(i,j) = i.$$

Of course

$$\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{R}} = \{T_{i,j}^{-1} : (i,j) \in E\}$$

forms a finite conformal directed Markov system, and $\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{R}}$ is irreducible since the map $T : J \to J$ is transitive. In addition, Condition C is satisfied for $\mathcal{S}$ because J is not contained in any any real analytic submanifold of dimension $\leq d-1$. Define the potential $\hat{\psi} : E_A^{\mathbb{N}} \to \mathbb{R}$ by

$$\hat{\psi}(\omega) = \psi\big(\pi_{\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{R}}}(\omega)\big).$$

The potential $\hat{\psi}$ is Hölder continuous as a composition of two H$\acute{}$older continuous functions; Hölder continuity of $\pi_{\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{R}}}$ with a standard metric on the symbol space follows immediately from the expanding property and a detailed proof can befound eg. in [PU2].

$$\mu_\psi = \mu_{\hat{\psi}} \circ \pi_{\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{R}}}^{-1}.$$

Moreover, it was proved in [PU2] that the measure–preserving dynamical systems $(T : J \to J, \mu_\psi)$ and $(\sigma : E_A^{\mathbb{N}} \to E_A^{\mathbb{N}}, \mu_{\hat{\psi}})$ are isomorphic. Hence (see Observation 29), the measure–preserving dynamical systems $(T : J \to J, \mu_\psi)$ and $\big(T_{\mathcal{S}} : \mathring{J}_{\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{R}}} \to \mathring{J}_{\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{R}}}, \mu_\psi\big)$ are isomorphic and the proof is concluded by invoking Theorem 30 and Remark 32. □

6.3. **Equilibrium states for rational maps of the Riemann sphere $\widehat{\mathbb{C}}$ and Hölder continuous potentials with a pressure gap.** Let $f : \widehat{\mathbb{C}} \to \widehat{\mathbb{C}}$ be a rational map of degree larger than 1. Denote by $J(f)$ its Julia set. Let $\varphi : J(f) \to \mathbb{R}$ be a Hölder continuous function. As in previous sections keep $\mathrm{P}(\varphi)$ to denote its topological pressure with respect to the dynamical system generated by the map $f : J(f) \to J(f)$. M. Lyubich proved in [Ly] that in our context of rational functions each continuous function admits an equilibrium state. It was shown in [DU] that if φ (being Hölder continuous) has a pressure gap, i.e. if

$$\mathrm{P}(\varphi) > \frac{1}{n} \sup(S_n \varphi)$$

for some integer $n \geq 1$, then there exists a unique equilibrium measure for φ which we again denote by μ_φ.

In [SUZ] several strong stochastic properties of this equilibrium measure μ_φ have been deduced from a special inducing scheme. The induced map forms a conformal Iterated Function System, satisfying the Strong Separation Condition, in particular the Strong Open Set Condition.

Before proving Theorem 39 below, the main result of this section, we formulate a technical, now rather standard result; see in particular [SUZ] Proposition 10, for a similar statement.

Proposition 38. *If μ is a finite Borel measure in $\widehat{\mathbb{C}}$, then for every $\delta > 0$ there exists a finite partition $\alpha = \{U_i\}_{i\in I}$ of $\widehat{\mathbb{C}}$ with $\operatorname{diam}(U_i) < \delta$ (the diameter being calculated with respect to the spherical metric) for all $i \in I$, and such that*

$$\mu\left(\bigcup_{j\in I} B(\partial U_j, r)\right) \leq r^{1/2} \tag{6.6}$$

for all sufficiently small $r > 0$. In fact, the number $1/2$ in formula (6.6) can be replaced by any positive number smaller than 1.

For every $z \in \widehat{\mathbb{C}}$ denote by $\alpha(z)$ the only element of α containing z. Now we shall prove the following main result of this section.

Theorem 39. *Let $f : \widehat{\mathbb{C}} \to \widehat{\mathbb{C}}$ be an arbitrary rational map of degree larger than 1 whose Julia set is not contained in a real analytic curve (this is always the case if for instance $\operatorname{HD}(J) > 1$). Let $\varphi : J(f) \to \mathbb{R}$ be a Hölder continuous function with a pressure gap. Then $(J(f), f, \mu_\varphi)$ forms a weakly Markov system with thin annuli property. Consequently, the assertion of Theorem 7 holds for this system.*

Proof. In order to check that the required properties hold, we refer to appropriate results in [SUZ].

Item (i) in Definition 3 of weakly Markov systems follows from Theorem 54 in [SUZ]; see also Theorem 4.2 of [MT] for a more detailed estimate of the decay of correlations in presence of good inducing schemes.

Item (ii) of this definition holds in this one-dimensional setting, since the limit under consideration exists μ_φ–a.e. and is equal to the Hausdorff dimension of the measure μ_φ, which is a positive number.

By virtue of Remark 5, in order to prove property (iii) of Definition 3, it is enough to check that the Weak Partition Existence Condition holds. We do it now. Indeed, Proposition 38 provides a partition α with elements of arbitrarily small diameter, satisfying the estimate (6.6). If $\max\{\operatorname{diam}(U_i) : i \in I\}$ is sufficiently small, then $h_{\mu_\varphi}(f, \alpha) > 0$ as can be immediately seen by combining Shannon–Breiman–McMillan Theorem together with a local entropy formula in [KB].

Now, we shall argue that condition (2.5) in the Definition 6 (Weak Partition Existence Condition) is satisfied. Fix $\beta > 0$ arbitrary (later it will be needed to be sufficiently large) and for every integer $n \geq 1$ put

$$A_n := f^{-n}\big(\bigcup_{i\in I} B(\partial U_i, e^{-\beta n})\big).$$

Using the estimate (6.6) and f–invariance of measure μ_φ, we see that

$$\mu_\varphi(A_n) \leq e^{-(\beta/2)n}$$

for every $n \geq 1$ provided that $\beta > 0$ is sufficiently large. Since the series $\sum_{n\geq 1} e^{-(\beta/2)n}$ converges, Borel-Cantelli Lemma thus applies and it tells us that for μ_φ–a.e. $x \in J(f)$ there exists an integer $N = N(x) \geq 1$ such that for all integers $n \geq N$

$$B\big(f^n(x), e^{-\beta n}\big) \subset \alpha(f^n(x)). \tag{6.7}$$

Keep such an x and assume in addition that

$$x \notin \bigcup_{n=0}^{\infty} \bigcup_{i\in I} f^{-n}(\partial U_i).$$

The set A of such all points $x \in J(f)$ is of full measure, i.e. $\mu_\varphi(A) = 1$. For all integers $n \geq N = N(x)$ denote by $\alpha_N^n(x)$ the only element of the partition $\bigvee_{k=N}^n f^{-k}(\alpha)$, containing the point x. Similarly, denote by $\alpha_0^{N-1}(x)$ the only element of the partition $\bigvee_{k=0}^{N-1} f^{-k}(\alpha)$, containing the point x. It follows from (6.7) that

$$\alpha_N^n(x) \supset \bigcap_{k=N}^{n} f^{-k}\big(B(f^k(x), e^{-k\beta})\big).$$

Note also that

$$f^{-k}\big(B(f^k(x), e^{-k\beta})\big) \supset B\big(x, e^{-k(\beta+\Delta)}\big),$$

where e^Δ is a Lipschitz constant, with respect to the spherical metric, of the map $f : \widehat{\mathbb{C}} \to \widehat{\mathbb{C}}$. Thus,

$$\alpha_N^n(x) \supset \bigcap_{k=N}^{n} B\big(x, e^{-k(\beta+\Delta)}\big) = B\big(x, e^{-n(\beta+\Delta)}\big)$$

Finally, since $\alpha_0^n(x) = \alpha_0^{N-1}(x) \vee \alpha_N^n(x)$ and since $x \notin \bigcup_{n=0}^\infty \bigcup_{i\in I} f^{-n}(\partial U_i)$, there exists $\rho(x) > 0$ such that $B(x, \rho(x)) \subset \alpha_0^{N-1}(x)$. Thus, $\alpha_0^n(x)$ contains the ball $B\big(x, e^{-n(\beta+\Delta)}\big)$ for every integer $n \geq 1$ large enough (depending on x), and therefore $\alpha_0^n(x) \supset B\big(x, C(x)e^{-n(\beta+\Delta)}\big)$ for every integer $n \geq 1$, where $C(x)$ is some positive finite constant depending on x. Hence, the Weak Partition Existence Condition holds and property (iii) of Definition 3 is established.

The Thin Annuli Property is a consequence of the above mentioned fine inducing procedure, see [SUZ], Section 3. We follow the notation of [SUZ], especially Section 8 of this paper. The fine inducing construction leads to a conformal Iterated Function System (IFS), satisfying the Strong Separation Condition, and such that the limit set of this system is of full μ_φ measure. We denote this system by $\mathcal{S}$. We recall briefly the way this induced system is constructed. For a properly chosen topological disc U, the system $\mathcal{S}$ is defined by a family of conformal univalent homeomorphisms $\phi_e : U \to D_e$, $e \in E$, where E is some countable set and $\overline{D}_e \subset U$ for every $e \in E$. Each map ϕ_e, $e \in E$, is just, a suitably chosen, holomorphic branch of the inverse of some iterate of f, say $f^{N(e)}$, mapping U onto D_e. As usually, denote the corresponding projection from $E^{\mathbb{N}}$ to $\widehat{\mathbb{C}}$ by $\pi_{\mathcal{S}}$. The iterated function system $\mathcal{S}$, together with the summable Hölder potential

$$\overline{\varphi} = S_{N(e)}\varphi \circ \pi_{\mathcal{S}} - \mathrm{P}(\varphi)N(e) : E^{\mathbb{N}} \to \mathbb{R},$$

arising naturally from the inducing procedure, admits an (invariant) equilibrium state which is equivalent to the initial measure μ_φ. We claim that the IFS $\mathcal{S}$ together with the (induced) potential $\overline{\varphi}$, satisfies the hypotheses of Theorem 30, with f therein being replaced by $\overline{\varphi}$. We shall sketch the argument here, referring to appropriate estimates in [SUZ]. The estimate which we need to verify the assumption of Theorem 30 is the following (see (6.4))

$$\sum_{e\in E} \exp\left(\inf\left(\overline{\varphi}|_{[e]}\right)\right)||\phi_e'||^{-\beta} < +\infty \tag{6.8}$$

with some $\beta > 0$. Note, however, that $\exp\left(\inf\left(\overline{\varphi}|_{[e]}\right)\right)$ is multiplicatively comparable to $\mu_\varphi(D_e)$ independently of e, and, consequently, in order to verify (6.8), it is enough to check that

$$\int |F'|^\beta d\mu_\varphi < \infty \quad \text{for some} \quad \beta > 0, \tag{6.9}$$

where the map F is defined on each set D_e just as $(\phi_e)^{-1}$. This can be easily done by using the estimates provided in [SUZ]. Indeed, by the definition of F and the system $\mathcal{S}$, we have that $F|_{D_e} = f^{N(e)}|_{D_e}$. Moreover, the estimates in [SUZ] (see e.g. the formula (3.1) in [SUZ]) show that

$$\mu_\varphi\left(\bigcup_{e:\, N(e)\geq n} D_e\right) \leq 2e^{-n\gamma}$$

for every integer $n \geq 1$ and some $\gamma > 0$. Using the trivial estimate $|F'| \leq ||f'||^{N(e)}$, (6.9) follows immediately. Finally, Condition C holds since the Julia set is not contained in a real analytic curve.

Therefore, we are in position to apply Theorem 30, and the measure μ_φ has the Thin Annuli Property. □

6.4. **Dynamically Semi–Regular Meromorphic Functions.** Let $f : \mathbb{C} \to \widehat{\mathbb{C}}$ be a meromorphic function. Let $\mathrm{Sing}(f^{-1})$ be the set of all singular points of f^{-1}, i. e. the set of all points $w \in \widehat{\mathbb{C}}$ such that if W is any open connected neighborhood of w, then there exists a connected component U of $f^{-1}(W)$ such that the map $f : U \to W$ is not bijective. Of course, if f is a rational function, then $\mathrm{Sing}(f^{-1}) = f(\mathrm{Crit}(f))$. Define

$$\mathrm{PS}(f) := \bigcup_{n=0}^{\infty} f^n(\mathrm{Sing}(f^{-1})).$$

The function f is called *topologically hyperbolic* if

$$\mathrm{dist}_{\,\mathrm{Euclid}}(J_f, \mathrm{PS}(f)) > 0,$$

and it is called *expanding* if there exist $c > 0$ and $\lambda > 1$ such that

$$|(f^n)'(z)| \geq c\lambda^n$$

for all integers $n \geq 1$ and all points $z \in J_f \setminus f^{-n}(\infty)$. Note that every topologically hyperbolic meromorphic function is *tame* (see definition before Theorem 42). A meromorphic function that is both topologically hyperbolic and expanding is called *hyperbolic*. The meromorphic function $f : \mathbb{C} \to \widehat{\mathbb{C}}$ is called dynamically *semi-regular* if it is of finite order, commonly denoted by ρ_f, and satisfies the following rapid growth condition for its derivative.

$$|f'(z)| \geq \kappa^{-1}(1+|z|)^{\alpha_1}(1+|f(z)|)^{\alpha_2}\,, \quad z \in J_f, \tag{6.10}$$

with some constant $\kappa > 0$ and α_1, α_2 such that $\alpha_2 > \max\{-\alpha_1, 0\}$. Set $\alpha := \alpha_1 + \alpha_2$.

Let $h : J_f \to \mathbb{R}$ be a weakly Hölder continuous function in the sense of [MayU]. The definition, introduced in [MayU] is somewhat technical and we will not provide it in the current paper. What is important is that each bounded, uniformly locally Hölder function $h : J_f \to \mathbb{R}$ is weakly Hölder. Fix $\tau > \alpha_2$ as required in [MayU]. For $t \in \mathbb{R}$, let

$$\psi_t = -t \log |f'|_\tau + h \tag{6.11}$$

where $|f'(z)|_\tau$ is the norm, or, equivalently, the scaling factor, of the derivative of f evaluated at a point $z \in J_f$ with respect to the Riemannian metric

$$|d\tau(z)| = (1+|z|)^{-\tau}|dz|.$$

For any $t > \rho_f/\alpha$ let $\mathcal{L}_t : C_b(J_f) \to C_b(J_f)$ be the corresponding *Perron–Frobenius operator* given by the formula

$$\mathcal{L}_t g(z) = \sum_{w \in f^{-1}(z)} g(w) e^{\psi_t(w)}.$$

The hypothesis $t > \rho_f/\alpha$ guaranties that the series

$$\sum_{w \in f^{-1}(z)} |f'(w)|_\tau^{-t}$$

converges uniformly on J_f, and, in particular, the linear operator $\mathcal{L}_t : C_b(J_f) \to C_b(J_f)$ is well defined and bounded. It was shown in [MayU] that, for every $z \in J_f$, the limit

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \mathcal{L}_t \mathbb{1}(z)$$

exists and takes on the same common value, which we denote by $\mathrm{P}(t)$ and call *the topological pressure* of the potential ψ_t. The following theorem was proved in [MayU].

Theorem 40. *If $f : \mathbb{C} \to \widehat{\mathbb{C}}$ is a dynamically semi-regular meromorphic function and $h : J_f \to \mathbb{R}$ is a weakly Hölder continuous potential, then for every $t > \rho_f/\alpha$ there exist uniquely determined Borel probability measures m_t and μ_t (which do depend on the function h too even though this is not explicitly indicated) on J_f with the following properties.*

(a) $\mathcal{L}_t^* m_t = m_t$.

(b) $\mathrm{P}(t) = \sup\left\{h_\mu(f) + \int \psi_t \, d\mu : \mu \circ f^{-1} = \mu \ \text{ and } \ \int \psi_t \, d\mu > -\infty\right\}$.

(c) $\mu_t \circ f^{-1} = \mu_t$, $\int \psi_t \, d\mu_t > -\infty$, *and* $h_{\mu_t}(f) + \int \psi_t \, d\mu_t = \mathrm{P}(t)$.

(d) *The measures μ_t and m_t are equivalent and the Radon–Nikodym derivative $\frac{d\mu_t}{dm_t}$ has a nowhere-vanishing Hölder continuous version which is bounded from above.*

Item (a) (along with (d)) essentially means that m_t and μ_t are Gibbs states of the potential ψ_t, while items (b) and (c) mean that μ_t is an equilibrium state for the potential ψ_t. We shall prove the following.

Theorem 41. *Let $f : \mathbb{C} \to \widehat{\mathbb{C}}$ be a dynamically semi-regular meromorphic function whose Julia set is not contained in a real analytic curve (this is always the case if for instance $\mathrm{HD}(J) > 1$). Let $t > \rho_f/\alpha$, and let $h : J_f \to \mathbb{R}$ be a weakly Hölder continuous potential. Then the measure–preserving dynamical system $\big(f : \mathbb{C} \to \widehat{\mathbb{C}}, \mu_t\big)$ is weakly Markov and satisfies the thin annuli property. In particular, the exponential one laws of* (2.6) *and* (2.7) *hold for the dynamical system $\big(f : \mathbb{C} \to \widehat{\mathbb{C}}, \mu_t\big)$.*

Proof. Property (i) of being weakly Markov (i.e. of Definition 3) for the dynamical system $\big(f : \mathbb{C} \to \widehat{\mathbb{C}}, \mu_t\big)$ has been proved in [MayU] as Theorem 6.16. Property (ii) is a part of Theorem 8.1 therein. For property (iii) it suffices to notice that the Weak Partition Existence Condition holds. And it does because of the first displayed formula after (6.22) in the proof of Theorem 6.25 (Variational Principle) in [MayU], and because the map f is expanding.

We are thus left to prove the thin annuli property. As in the case of conformal graph directed Markov systems it will be based on an inducing argument. The point is that one can construct conformal IFSs having any given non-periodic recurrent point of the Julia set in the interior of its seed set. We formulate the appropriate theorem in a more general setting which does not enlarge the volume of our considerations. Following [PU1] and [SU] we call a meromorphic function $f : \mathbb{C} \to \widehat{\mathbb{C}}$ *tame* if

$$J(f) \setminus \overline{\mathrm{PS}(f)} \neq \emptyset.$$

The following theorem was proved in [D].

Theorem 42. *Let $f : \mathbb{C} \to \widehat{\mathbb{C}}$ be a tame meromorphic function. Fix a non-periodic point $z \in J(f) \setminus \overline{PS(f)}$, $\kappa > 1$, and $K > 1$. Then for all $L > 1$ and for all $r > 0$ sufficiently small there exists an open connected set $V = V(z, r) \subset \mathbb{C} \setminus \overline{PS(f)}$ such that*

(a) *If $U \in \mathrm{Comp}(f^{-n}(V))$ and $U \cap V \neq \emptyset$, then $U \subseteq V$.*
(b) *If $U \in \mathrm{Comp}(f^{-n}(V))$ and $U \cap V \neq \emptyset$, then for all $w, w' \in U$,*

$$|(f^n)'(w)| \geq L \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{|(f^n)'(w)|}{|(f^n)'(w')|} \leq K.$$

(c) $\overline{B(z, r)} \subset U \subset B(z, \kappa r) \subset \mathbb{C} \setminus \overline{PS(f)}$.

Each nice set canonically gives rise to a countable alphabet conformal iterated function system in the sense considered in the previous sections of the present paper. Namely, put

$$\mathrm{Comp}_*(V) = \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathrm{Comp}(f^{-n}(V)).$$

For every $U \in \mathrm{Comp}_*(V)$ let $\tau_V(U) \geq 1$ the unique integer $n \geq 1$ such that $U \in \mathrm{Comp}(f^{-n}(V))$. Put further

$$\phi_U := f_U^{-\tau_V(U)} : V \to U$$

and keep in mind that

$$\phi_U(V) = U.$$

Denote by E_V the subset of all elements U of $\mathrm{Comp}_*(V)$ such that

(a) $\phi_U(V) \subset V$,

(b) $f^k(U) \cap V = \emptyset \quad \text{for all} \quad k = 1, 2, \ldots, \tau_V(U) - 1.$

The collection

$$\mathcal{S}_V := \{\phi_U : V \to V\}$$

of all such inverse branches forms obviously a conformal iterated function system in the sense considered in the previous sections of the present paper. In other words, the elements of $\mathcal{S}_V$ are formed by all holomorphic inverse branches of the first return map $f_V : V \to V$. In particular, $\tau_V(U)$ is the first return time of all points in $U = \phi_U(V)$ to V. We define the function $N_V : E_V^{\mathbb{N}} \to \mathbb{N}_1$ by setting

$$N_V(\omega) := \tau_V(\omega_1).$$

Let

$$\pi_V : E_V^{\mathbb{N}} \to \widehat{\mathbb{C}}$$

be the canonical projection induced by the iterated function system $\mathcal{S}_V$. Let

$$J_V = \pi_V\big(E_V^{\mathbb{N}}\big)$$

be the limit set of the system $\mathcal{S}_V$. Clearly

$$J_V \subset J(f).$$

It is immediate from our definitions that

$$\tau_V(\pi(\omega)) = N_V(\omega)$$

for all $\omega \in E_V^{\mathbb{N}}$. It is a general fact from abstract ergodic theory that $\mu_{t,V}$, the conditional measure of μ_t on V is f_V–invariant and ergodic. It is clear that $\mu_{t,V}$ is the (only) equilibrium state of the Hölder continuous summable potential

$$\tilde{\psi}_{t,V} := \psi_{t,V} - \mathrm{P}(\psi_t)\tau_V : J_V \to \mathbb{R},$$

where

$$\psi_{t,V}(x) := \sum_{j=0}^{\tau_V(x)-1} \psi_t \circ f^j(x).$$

Since the point z is recurrent, $z \in J_V$, and since $z \in V$, the thin boundary property of measure μ_t will follow from Theorem 30 provided that condition (6.4) and Condition C are verified. But the former follows from the assumption that $t > \rho_f/\alpha$ while the latter holds since the Julia set is not contained in any real analytic curve. □

We shall now deal with three classes of systems that are not (necessarily) conformal. We prove for them the Weakly Markov Property and corresponding exponential one laws of Theorem 8 but leave open the Thin Annuli Property and corresponding exponential one laws of Theorem 7.

6.5. **Distance Expanding Maps and Expanding Repellers.** In this class of examples conformality is not assumed. We work in the setting similar to the one of Subsection 6.2

Definition 43. Let U be an open subset of $\mathbb{R}^d$, $d \geq 1$. Let J be a compact subset of U. Let $T : U \to \mathbb{R}^d$ be a $C^{1+\epsilon}$–differentiable map. The map T is called an expanding repeller, if the following conditions are satisfied:

(1) $T(J) = J$,

(2) for every $z \in J$ the derivative $T'(z) : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}^d$ is invertible and the norm of its inverse is smaller than 1.

(3) there exists an open set V such that $\overline{V} \subset U$ and
$$J = \bigcap_{k=0}^{\infty} T^{-n}(V).$$

(4) the map $T_{|J} : J \to J$ is topologically transitive.

We shall prove the following main result of this subsection.

Theorem 44. *Let $T : J \to J$ be an expanding repeller, let $\psi : J \to \mathbb{R}$ be a Hölder continuous potential, and Let μ_ψ be the corresponding equilibrium (Gibbs) state. Then the measure–preserving dynamical system $\big(T : J \to J, \mu_\psi\big)$ is weakly Markov. In particular, the exponential one laws of* (2.8) *and its version for the normalized return times hold for the dynamical system $\big(T : J \to J, \mu_\psi\big)$.*

Proof. Everything of Subsection 6.2 except claims of conformality and the thin boundary property remains valid in the present subsection. This allows us to apply now Theorem 8 and conclude the proof. □

6.6. **Equilibrium measures (states) for holomorphic endomorphisms of complex projective spaces.** Let $f : \mathbb{P}^k \to \mathbb{P}^k$ be a holomorphic endomorphism of a complex projective space $\mathbb{P}^k$, $k \geq 1$, and let J be the Julia set of f, which is commonly defined to be the topological support of the (unique) Borel probability f–invariant measure of maximal entropy. Let $\varphi : J \to \mathbb{R}$ be a Hölder continuous function. It was proved in [UZ] that if
$$\sup(\varphi) - \inf(\varphi) < \kappa_f,$$

where $0 < \kappa_f \leq \log d$ is some constant depending on the map f, then φ admits a unique equilibrium state μ_φ on J. Further strong stochastic properties of the measure μ_φ were established in [SUZ2]. A potential φ satisfying the above condition is called admissible. We shall prove the following main result of this section.

Theorem 45. *Let $f : \mathbb{P}^k \to \mathbb{P}^k$, $k \geq 1$, be a holomorphic endomorphism of a complex projective space $\mathbb{P}^k$ of degree $d \geq 1$. Let $\varphi : J(f) \to \mathbb{R}$ be an admissible potential, and let μ_φ be its unique equilibrium state. Then $(J(f), f, \mu_\varphi)$ forms a weakly Markov system. Consequently, Theorem 8 holds for this system.*

Proof. We shall check that the system satisfies the requirements of Definition 3 defining weakly Markov systems. Item (i) of this definition follows, as in one–dimensional setting, from Theorem 7.6 in [SUZ2]. Item (2), i.e. positive lower pointwise dimension, can be deduced from much more precise estimate of the lower pointwise dimension of some f–invariant Borel probability measures obtained in [Du], Theorem A. Note that the hypothesis of this theorem,

$$h_\mu(f) > (k-1)\log d,$$

is fulfilled for our system since firstly,

$$\begin{aligned} h_{\mu_\varphi}(f) + \int_J \varphi \, d\mu_\varphi = \mathrm{P}(\varphi) \geq h_m(f) + \int_J \varphi \, dm &\geq k \log d + \inf(\varphi) \\ &> k \log d + \sup(\varphi) - \log d \\ &= \sup \varphi + (k-1)\log d, \end{aligned}$$

where we denoted by m the measure of maximal entropy. Hence,

$$h_{\mu_\varphi}(f) > (k-1)\log d + \big(\sup(\varphi) - \int \varphi \, d\mu_\varphi\big) \geq (k-1)\log d,$$

as required. Finally, item (3) is proved in the same way as in the previous, one–dimensional case, dealt with in Section 6.3. □

Note however, that the above system is not conformal, and in this case we are not able to prove thin annuli property, so we can only obtain Theorem 8.

6.7. **Axiom A diffeomorphisms.** Finally, we note that our approach applies easily to the classical case of Axiom A diffeomorphisms, thus giving a simple proof of the following.

Theorem 46. *Let $f : M \to M$ be an Axiom A diffeomorphism on a smooth manifold M. Let $\Omega \subset M$ be its non-wandering set. Further, let $\varphi : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$ be a Hölder continuous potential, and let (see* [Bo]*) μ_φ be the unique equilibrium (Gibbs) measure associated to this potential. Then the system (Ω, μ_φ, f) is weakly Markov. Consequently, Theorem 8 holds for this system.*

Proof. We shall check that all requirements of Definition 3 are fulfilled. Indeed, item (i) is an old result due to Bowen ([Bo]). Item (ii) can be checked by using [LY] and the fact that metric entropy of the system is positive. Finally, in order to check item (iii) (no small return), we apply again the Weak Partition Existence Condition. The construction of

such partition provided in the proof of Theorem 39 goes through unchanged, even though, contrary to the case considered in Theorem 39, the system studied here is invertible. □

Remark. The simplicity of this proof is due to the fact that we have not touched the concept of the Perron–Frobenius operator at all, but used only exponential decay of correlations. We would like to emphasize that employing the method of Perron–Frobenius operator routinely requires, a frequently painful, and somewhat odd, procedure of making an invertible system non-invertible. Our method allowed us to avoid this.

References

[Bo] R. Bowen, Equilibrium states and the ergodic theory of Anosov diffeomorphisms, Lecture Notes in Math. 470, Springer, Berlin, 1975.

[BS] L. Barreira, B. Saussol, Hausdorff dimension of measures via Poincaré recurrence, Commun. Math. Phys. 219 (2001) 443–463.

[Co] John B. Conway, Functions of one complex variable, Graduate Texts in Mathematics 11, Springer, 1978.

[DFSU] T. Das, L. Fishman, D. Simmons, M. Urbański, Extremality and dynamically defined measures, Part II: Measures from conformal dynamical systems, arXiv:1508.05592v1.

[D] N. Dobbs, Nice sets and invariant densities in complex dynamics, Math. Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc. 150 (2011) 157–165.

[DU] M. Denker, M. Urbański, Ergodic theory of equilibrium states for rational maps, Nonlinearity 4 (1991) no. 1 103-134.

[Du] Ch. Dupont, On the dimension of invariant measures of endomorphisms of $\mathbb{CP}^k$, Math. Ann. 349 (2008) no. 3 509–528.

[Hi] E. Hille, Analytic Function Theory, Vols. I and II, Ginn, Boston, 1962.

[Hir] M. Hirata, Poisson law for Axiom A diffeomorphisms, Ergodic Th. Dynam. Systems 13 (1993) 533–566.

[HSV] M. Hirata, B. Saussol, S. Vaienti, Statistics of return times: a general framework and new applications, Commun. Math. Phys. 206 (1999) 33–55.

[IM] T. Iwaniec, G. Martin, Geometric function theory and non-linear analysis, Clarendon Press, 2002.

[KB] A. Katok, M. Brin, On local entropy, Lecture Notes in Math. 1007 (1983) 30–38.

[LY] F. Ledrappier, L.S. Young, The metric entropy of diffeomorphisms. II. Relations between entropy, exponents and dimension, Ann. of Math. (2) 122 (1985) 540–574.

[Ly] M. Lyubich, Entropy properties of rational endomorphisms of the Riemann sphere, Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems 3 (1983) 351-385.

[MauU1] D. Mauldin, M. Urbański, Dimensions and measures in infinite iterated function systems, Proc. London Math. Soc. (3) 73 (1996) no. 1, 105-154.

[MauU2] D. Mauldin, M. Urbański, Gibbs states on the symbolic space over an infinite alphabet, Israel. J. of Math. 125 (2001) 93–130.

[MauU3] D. Mauldin, M. Urbański, Graph directed Markov systems: Geometry and dynamics of limit sets, Cambridge University Press, 2003.

[MayU] V. Mayer, M. Urbański, Thermodynamical formalism and multifractal analysis for meromorphic functions of finite order, Memoirs of AMS 203 (2010) no. 954.

[MT] I. Melbourne. D. Terhesiu, Decay of correlations for nonuniformly expanding systems with general return times, Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems 34 (2014) 893–918.

[PU1] F. Przytycki, M. Urbański, Rigidity of tame rational functions, Bull. Pol. Acad. Sci. Math. 47.2 (1999) 163–182.

[PU2] F. Przytycki, M. Urbański, Conformal fractals: Ergodic theory methods, Cambridge University Press (2010).

[STV] B. Saussol, S. Troubetzkoy, S. Vaienti: Recurrence, dimensions, and Lyapunov exponents, J. Statist. Phys. 106 (2002) 623–634.
[SU] B. Skorulski, M. Urbański, Finer Fractal Geometry for analytic families of conformal dynamical systems, Dynamical Systems 29 (2014) 369–398.
[SUZ] M. Szostakiewicz, M. Urbański, A. Zdunik, Fine inducing and equilibrium measures for rational functions of the Riemann sphere, Israel J. Math. 210 (2015) 399-465.
[SUZ2] M. Szostakiewicz, M. Urbański, A. Zdunik, Stochastics and thermodynamics for equilibrium measures of holomorphic endomorphisms on complex projective spaces, Monatsh. Math. 174 (2014) 141-162.
[Urb] M. Urbański: Recurrence rates for Loosely Markov dynamical systems, J. Australian Math. Soc. 82 (2007) 39–57.
[UZ] M. Urbański, A. Zdunik, Equilibrium measures for holomorphic endomorphisms of complex projective spaces, Fundamenta Math. 220 (2013) 23–69.
[Wa] P. Walters, An introduction to ergodic theory, Springer-Verlag, 1982.

Łukasz Pawelec, Department of Mathematics and Mathematical Economics, Warsaw School of Economics, al. Niepodległości 162, 02-554 Warszawa, Poland
E-mail address: LPawel@sgh.waw.pl

Mariusz Urbański, University of North Texas, Department of Mathematics, 1155 Union Circle #311430, Denton, TX 76203-5017, USA
E-mail address: urbanski@unt.edu

Anna Zdunik, Institute of Mathematics, University of Warsaw, ul. Banacha 2, 02-097 Warszawa, Poland
E-mail address: A.Zdunik@mimuw.edu.pl